arXiv:1409.1681v2 [math.CO] 3 Nov 2014

Graphs with Large Disjunctive Total Domination Number

[1]Michael A. Henning* and [1,2]Viroshan Naicker†

[1]Department of Pure and Applied Mathematics
University of Johannesburg
Auckland Park, 2006 South Africa
Email: mahenning@uj.ac.za

[2]Department of Mathematics
Rhodes University
Grahamstown, 6140 South Africa
Email: v.naicker@ru.ac.za

Abstract

Let G be a graph with no isolated vertex. In this paper, we study a parameter that is a relaxation of arguably the most important domination parameter, namely the total domination number, $\gamma_t(G)$. A set S of vertices in G is a disjunctive total dominating set of G if every vertex is adjacent to a vertex of S or has at least two vertices in S at distance 2 from it. The disjunctive total domination number, $\gamma_t^d(G)$, is the minimum cardinality of such a set. We observe that $\gamma_t^d(G) \le \gamma_t(G)$. Let G be a connected graph on n vertices with minimum degree δ. It is known [J. Graph Theory 35 (2000), 21–45] that if $\delta \ge 2$ and $n \ge 11$, then $\gamma_t(G) \le 4n/7$. Further [J. Graph Theory 46 (2004), 207–210] if $\delta \ge 3$, then $\gamma_t(G) \le n/2$. We prove that if $\delta \ge 2$ and $n \ge 8$, then $\gamma_t^d(G) \le n/2$ and we characterize the extremal graphs.

Keywords: Total dominating set; disjunctive total dominating set.
AMS subject classification: 05C69

*Research supported in part by the South African National Research Foundation and the University of Johannesburg

†Research supported in part by the University of Johannesburg, Rhodes University and the Claude Leon Foundation

1 Introduction

In this paper we continue the study of disjunctive total domination in graphs introduced and studied by the authors in [11]. As remarked in [11], a common issue in network design is to minimize the trade-off between resource allocation and redundancy. Key resources are usually expensive and cannot be allocated across an entire network, and, in addition, if there is a possibility of resource failure at a particular node, redundancy and backup requirements then become vital but require extra resources to be allocated. This problem has been addressed, in various guises, by using graphs as a model for the network and searching for vertex subsets which are 'close' to the rest of the graph and satisfy pertinent redundancy criteria. A neural network that learns and attempts to optimally allocate resources as it grows has attracted considerable attention as is evidenced, for example, by the article of Platt [13].

Domination and, in particular, total domination are well studied topics in the graph theory literature which attempt a solution of this problem (see, for example, [7, 8, 9, 12]. Let G be a graph that serves as a model of a network and let G have vertex set V. On the one hand, for purposes of resource allocation, we select a set D of vertices, called a *dominating set*, of G such that every vertex in $V \setminus D$ is adjacent to at least one vertex in D. On the other hand, for the purpose of extending the domination problem to include redundancy, we select a set S of vertices, called a *total dominating set*, abbreviated TD-set, of G such that every vertex in V, including those in S, is adjacent to at least one vertex in S. However, as remarked in [11], given the sheer scale of modern networks (see [3]), many existing domination type structures are expensive to implement. Variations on the theme of dominating and total dominating sets studied to date tend to focus on adding restrictions which in turn raises their implementation costs. As an alternative a relaxation of the domination number, called *disjunctive domination*, was proposed and studied by Goddard et al. [6]. This concept was recently extended in [11] to a relaxation of total domination, called *disjunctive total domination*. This new variant of total domination offers greater flexibility in the modelling of the network resource allocation problem while maintaining the redundancy and proximity features of the classical total domination parameter. In addition, as shown in [11] and by our main result below, there is a significant reduction in implementation cost over total domination in terms of the number of nodes of the network.

A set S of vertices in G is a *disjunctive total dominating set*, abbreviated DTD-set, of G if every vertex is adjacent to a vertex of S or has at least two vertices in S at distance 2 from it. For example, the set of eight darkened vertices in the graph G shown in Figure 1 is a DTD-set of G. We say that a vertex $v \in V$ is *disjunctively totally dominated*, abbreviated DT-*dominated*, by a set S, if v has a neighbor in S or if v is at distance 2 from at least two vertices of S. Further if v has a neighbor in S, we say S *totally dominates* the vertex v, while if v is at distance 2 from at least two vertices of S, we say S *disjunctively dominates* the vertex v. The *disjunctive total domination number*, $\gamma_t^d(G)$, is the minimum cardinality of a DTD-set in G. A DTD-set of cardinality $\gamma_t^d(G)$ is called a $\gamma_t^d(G)$-set. Examples of two $\gamma_t^d(G)$-sets when G is a cycle on six vertices are shown in Figure 2(a) and Figure 2(b). In each case the darkened vertices represent a $\gamma_t^d(G)$-set. We remark that a feature of the

parameter is, depending on the graph, that a DTD-set may be chosen to be independent Figure 2(a) or connected Figure 2(b). The feature of choosing an independent DTD-set is essentially different from total domination in which independence is, by definition, lost. Further, if new vertices are added to the graph (nodes to a network) these may be added in a way that resources which are already allocated are, in a sense, 'buffered' by their existing neighbors. For example, the graphs in Figure 2(a) and Figure 2(b) have been modified by adding two additional vertices to give Figure 2(c) and Figure 2(d), respectively, while the existing DTD-set is preserved. In each case the vertices need not be adjacent to a vertex in the DTD-set. This is a different feature, again, from total domination in which if a new vertex is joined to the graph by an edge either the existing TD-set must be enlarged and a new resource allocated to the network, or the new vertex has to be joined to a vertex in an existing TD-set which invites possible resource overcrowding by new users.



Figure 1: A graph G with $\gamma_t^d(G) = 8$ and $\gamma_t(G) = 11$.



Figure 2: Novel features of DTD-sets

The *total domination number* of G, denoted by $\gamma_t(G)$, is the minimum cardinality of a TD-set of G. Every TD-set is a DTD-set, implying the following observation.

Observation 1 ([11]) *For every graph G with no isolated vertex, $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq \gamma_t(G)$.*

The known upper bounds on the total domination number of a graph G in terms of its order n and small minimum degree $\delta(G)$ are summarized in Table 1.

$\delta(G) \geq 1$	$\Rightarrow$	$\gamma_t(G)$	$\leq$	$\frac{2}{3}n$ if $n \geq 3$ and G is connected	([5])
$\delta(G) \geq 2$	$\Rightarrow$	$\gamma_t(G)$	$\leq$	$\frac{4}{7}n$ if $n \geq 11$ and G is connected	([10])
$\delta(G) \geq 3$	$\Rightarrow$	$\gamma_t(G)$	$\leq$	$\frac{1}{2}n$	([1, 4, 14])

Table 1: Upper bounds on the total domination number of a graph G.

By Observation 1 and the result of [5] shown in Table 1, if G is a connected graph of order $n \geq 3$, then $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq 2n/3$. The authors showed in [11] that this upper bound on the disjunctive total domination number can be improved ever-so-slightly. Further, they characterized the concomitant extremal graphs.

Theorem 2 ([11]) *If G is a connected graph of order $n \geq 8$, then $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq 2(n-1)/3$, and this bound is tight.*

In addition, the authors showed in [11] that the upper bound in Table 1 of $\gamma_t(G) \leq 4n/7$ when G has order $n \geq 11$ and $\delta(G) \geq 2$ holds for the disjunctive total domination number when the minimum degree is relaxed from 2 to 1 and G is restricted to the class of connected claw-free graphs of order $n > 14$. Further, they characterized the concomitant extremal graphs.

Theorem 3 ([11]) *If G is a connected, claw-free, graph of order $n > 14$, then $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq 4n/7$, and this bound is tight.*

In this paper, we show that if we restrict the minimum degree to at least 2, then the result of [10] shown in Table 1 on the total domination number can be improved significantly for the disjunctive total domination number. Perhaps surprisingly we show that the upper bound of one-half the order of a graph of [1, 4, 14] shown in Table 1 on the total domination number is an upper bound on the disjunctive total domination number even if we relax the minimum degree from 3 to 2. More precisely, we shall prove the following result.

Theorem 4 *If G is a connected graph of order $n \geq 13$, then $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq (n-1)/2$, and this bound is tight.*

Table 2 summarizes the upper bounds on the disjunctive total domination number of a graph G in terms of its order n and minimum degree $\delta(G)$.

$\delta(G) \geq 1$	$\Rightarrow$	$\gamma_t^d(G)$	$\leq$	$\frac{2}{3}(n-1)$ if $n \geq 8$ and G is connected	([11])
$\delta(G) \geq 1$	$\Rightarrow$	$\gamma_t^d(G)$	$\leq$	$\frac{4}{7}n$ if $n \geq 14$ and G is connected, claw-free	([11])
$\delta(G) \geq 2$	$\Rightarrow$	$\gamma_t^d(G)$	$\leq$	$\frac{1}{2}(n-1)$ if $n \geq 13$ and G is connected	(*Theorem* 4)

Table 2: Upper bounds on the disjunctive total domination number of a graph G.

1.1 Notation

For notation and graph theory terminology, we in general follow [7]. Specifically, let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph with vertex set V and edge set E. We denote the *degree* of v in G by $d_G(v)$. A vertex of degree k is called a *degree-k* vertex. The maximum (minimum) degree among the vertices of G is denoted by $\Delta(G)$ ($\delta(G)$, respectively). For a set $S \subseteq V$, the subgraph induced by S is denoted by $G[S]$, while the graph obtained from G be removing all vertices in S and their incident edges is denoted by $G - S$. For two vertices u and v in a connected graph G, the *distance* $d_G(u, v)$ between u and v is the length of a shortest u–v path in G. The *open neighborhood* of a vertex v is the set $N_G(v) = \{u \in V \mid uv \in E\}$ and the *closed neighborhood of* v is $N_G[v] = \{v\} \cup N_G(v)$. For a set $S \subseteq V$, its *open neighborhood* is the set $N_G(S) = \bigcup_{v \in S} N_G(v)$, and its *closed neighborhood* is the set $N_G[S] = N_G(S) \cup S$. If the graph G is clear from the context, we simply write $N(v)$, $N[v]$, $N(S)$, $N[S]$, $d(v)$ and $d(u, v)$ rather than $N_G(v)$, $N_G[v]$, $N_G(S)$, $N_G[S]$, $d_G(v)$, and $d_G(u, v)$, respectively.

A *cycle* and *path* on n vertices are denoted by C_n and P_n, respectively. For $m \geq 3$ and $n \geq 1$, we denote by $L_{m,n}$ the graph obtained by joining with an edge a vertex in C_m to an end-vertex of P_n. The graph $L_{m,n}$ is called a *key*.

A 4-*subdivision* of a graph G is the graph obtained from G by subdividing an edge of G four times. If e is an edge of a graph G, we let G_e denote the graph obtained from G by subdividing the edge e four times. If two graphs G and H are isomorphic, we write $G \cong H$. Let G be a graph with $\delta(G) \geq 2$. We define a vertex v of G to be *large* if $d_G(v) \geq 3$ and *small* if $d_G(v) = 2$. A *cycle edge* of G is an edge that belongs to a cycle in G. We call a vertex, v, in a graph G a *good-vertex* of G if it belongs to some $\gamma_t^d(G)$-set; otherwise, we call v a *bad-vertex* of G. We call an edge, e, in G a *good-edge* of G if there is a $\gamma_t^d(G)$-set which contains both vertices incident with e; otherwise, we call e a *bad-edge*.

1.2 Special Families

In this section we define several special families of graphs. Let

$$\mathcal{C} = \{C_3, C_4, C_5, C_6, C_7, C_8, C_9, C_{11}, C_{12}, C_{13}, C_{17}\}$$

be a family of cycles. A *daisy* with $k \geq 2$ *petals* is a connected graph that can be constructed from $k \geq 2$ disjoint cycles by identifying a set of k vertices, one from each cycle into one vertex. If the cycles have lengths n_1, n_2,..., n_k, we denote the daisy by $D(n_1, n_2, \ldots, n_k)$. Let $\mathcal{D} = \{D(3,3), D(4,4), D(3,7)\}$ be the family of three daisies shown in Figure 3.



$D(3,3)$ $D(4,4)$ $D(3,7)$

Figure 3: The family, $\mathcal{D}$, of daisies.

A *dumb-bell* is a connected graph on $n = n_1 + n_2 + \ell$ vertices that can be constructed by joining a vertex of a cycle C_{n_1} to a vertex of a cycle C_{n_2} by an edge and subdividing this

edge ℓ times. If $\ell = 0$ we denote the dumb-bell by $D_b(n_1, n_2)$, and if $\ell \geq 1$ we denote the dumb-bell by $D_b(n_1, n_2, \ell)$. Let

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{D}_b &= \{D_b(3,4), D_b(3,3,1), D_b(4,4), D_b(3,4,1), D_b(3,3,2), D_b(4,7,2),\\ &\quad D_b(3,7,3), D_b(4,8,1), D_b(3,8,2), D_b(4,4,5), D_b(3,4,6), D_b(3,4,7)\}\end{aligned}$$

be the family of twelve dumb-bells shown in Figure 4.



Figure 4: The family, $\mathcal{D}_b$, of dumb-bell graphs.

Let U_1, U_2, U_3 and $X_1, X_2 \ldots X_{10}$ be the thirteen graphs shown in Figure 5. We define a *unit* to be a graph that is isomorphic to the graph U_i for some i, $1 \leq i \leq 3$, or the graph X_j for some j, $1 \leq j \leq 10$. The darkened vertex, named v, in each unit in Figure 5 we call the *link vertex* of the unit. For $i = 1, 2, 3$, we call a unit isomorphic to the graph U_i a *type-i unit*. A unit isomorphic to the graph X_j, $1 \leq j \leq 10$, we call a *X_j-unit*.



Figure 5: The graphs U_1, U_2, U_3 and $X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_{10}$.

For $n = n_1 + n_2 \geq 2$, let $G = G_0(n_1, n_2)$ be the graph obtained from the disjoint union of n_1 units of type-1 and n_2 units of type-2 by identifying the n link vertices, one from each unit, into one new vertex which we call the *identified vertex* of G. Let $\mathcal{G}_0$ denote the family of all such graphs G. For $n = n_1 + n_2 + 1 \geq 2$ and for $i = 1, 2, \ldots, 6$, let $G = G_i(n_1, n_2)$ be the graph obtained from the disjoint union of n_1 units of type-1, n_2 units of type-2, and one X_i-unit by identifying the n link vertices, one from each unit, into one new vertex which we call the *identified vertex* of G. Let $\mathcal{G}_i$ denote the family of all such graphs G. Let

$$\mathcal{G} = \bigcup_{i=0}^{6} \mathcal{G}_i.$$

A graph in each family $\mathcal{G}_i$, $0 \leq i \leq 6$, is shown in Figure 6, where the identified vertices are indicated in bold.



$G_0(3,2) \in \mathcal{G}_0$

$G_1(1,2) \in \mathcal{G}_1$ $G_2(1,2) \in \mathcal{G}_2$ $G_3(1,2) \in \mathcal{G}_3$

$G_4(1,2) \in \mathcal{G}_4$ $G_5(1,2) \in \mathcal{G}_5$ $G_6(1,2) \in \mathcal{G}_6$

Figure 6: Graphs in the family $\mathcal{G}$.

For $n = n_1 + n_2 + n_3 \geq 2$, let $H = H_0(n_1, n_2, n_3)$ be the graph obtained from the disjoint union of n_1 units of type-1, n_2 units of type-2 and n_3 units of type-3 by identifying the n link vertices, one from each unit, into one new vertex which we call the *identified vertex* of H. Let $\mathcal{H}_0$ denote the family of all such graphs H. For $n = n_1 + n_2 + n_3 + 1 \geq 2$ and for $i = 1, 2, \ldots, 10$, let $H = H_i(n_1, n_2, n_3)$ be the graph obtained from the disjoint union of n_1 units of type-1, n_2 units of type-2, n_3 units of type-3, and one X_i-unit by identifying the n

link vertices, one from each unit, into one new vertex which we call the *identified vertex* of H. Let $\mathcal{H}_i$ denote the family of all such graphs H. Let

$$\mathcal{H} = \bigcup_{i=0}^{10} \mathcal{H}_i.$$

We observe that $\mathcal{G}$ is a subfamily of $\mathcal{H}$; that is, $\mathcal{G} \subset \mathcal{H}$. Let $\mathcal{G}_b$ be the subfamily of $\mathcal{G}$ consisting of all dumb-bells. We observe that

$$\mathcal{G}_b = \{G_0(2,0), G_0(1,1), G_0(0,2), G_1(1,0), G_1(0,1), G_2(1,0), G_2(0,1)\}.$$

The family $\mathcal{G}_b \subset \mathcal{G}$ of seven dumb-bell graphs is shown in Figure 7.



Figure 7: The family $\mathcal{G}_b \subset \mathcal{G}$ of dumb-bell graphs.

Let $\mathcal{B} = \{B_1, B_2, \ldots, B_{11}\}$ be the family of eleven graphs shown in Figure 8, where the special vertices (Section 3.2) of each graph are darkened.



Figure 8: The family, $\mathcal{B}$, of graphs.

Let $\mathcal{F} = \{F_1, F_2, \ldots, F_6\}$ be the family of six graphs shown in Figure 9.



Figure 9: The family, $\mathcal{F}$, of graphs.

2 Main Results

Our aim in this paper is to improve the upper bound of Theorem 2 on the disjunctive total domination number of a connected graph when we impose a density condition by restricting the minimum degree to be at least 2. In this case, we show that the result of [10] given in Table 1 on the total domination number can be improved significantly for the disjunctive total domination number. Several authors (see [1, 4, 14]) showed that if G is a graph of order n with $\delta(G) \geq 3$, then $\gamma_t(G) \leq n/2$ (see Table 1). We prove that if we relax the minimum degree condition from $\delta(G) \geq 3$ to $\delta(G) \geq 2$, then $n/2$ is an upper bound on the disjunctive total domination number $\gamma_t^d(G)$, provided $n \geq 8$. More precisely, we prove the following result. A proof of Theorem 5 is given in Section 4.2.

Theorem 5 *Let G be a connected graph of order $n \geq 8$ with $\delta(G) \geq 2$. Then, $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq n/2$ with equality if and only if $G \in \{C_8, C_{12}, B_3, D_b(4,4), D_b(3,4,1), D_b(3,3,2)\} \cup \mathcal{F}$.*

The connected graphs with minimum degree at least 2 and order at least 18 that have maximum possible disjunctive total domination number are characterized in the following result, a proof of which is given in Section 4.3.

Theorem 6 *Let G be a connected graph of order $n \geq 18$ with $\delta(G) \geq 2$. Then, $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq (n-1)/2$ with equality if and only if $G \in \mathcal{H}$.*

Since the graphs that achieve equality in the upper bound of Theorem 5 all have order at most 12, we remark that Theorem 4 is an immediate consequence of Theorem 5 and Theorem 6. Further, we remark that the upper bound of Theorem 4 is sharp even for the class of bipartite graphs, for example, for $k \geq 0$ each graph $G_0(0,k) \in \mathcal{H}$ is bipartite.

3 Preliminary Results

Before presenting a proof of our main results, we first establish some preliminary results. We omit the proofs of these preliminary results which are straightforward, albeit tedious, to check.[1]

[1]Proof of several of the preliminary results can be found in the Appendix

Observation 7 *Let G be a graph with no isolated vertex and let F be a 4-subdivision of G. Then, $\gamma_t^d(F) \leq \gamma_t^d(G) + 2$.*

The disjunctive total domination number of a cycle C_n on n vertices is established in [11].

Proposition 8 ([11]) *For $n \geq 3$, $\gamma_t^d(C_n) = 2n/5$ if $n \equiv 0 \pmod 5$ and $\gamma_t^d(C_n) = \lceil 2(n+1)/5 \rceil$ otherwise.*

The daisies and dumb-bells with large disjunctive total domination number are characterized in Proposition 9 and Proposition 10, respectively.

Proposition 9 *If G is a daisy of order n, then $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq (n-1)/2$. Furthermore, $\gamma_t^d(G) = (n-1)/2$ if and only if $G \in \mathcal{D}$.*

Proposition 10 *If G is a dumb-bell of order n, then $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq n/2$. Furthermore, $\gamma_t^d(G) \geq (n-1)/2$ if and only if $G \in \mathcal{D}_b \cup \mathcal{G}_b$.*

The disjunctive total domination number of graphs in the family $\mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{D} \cup \mathcal{D}_b \cup \mathcal{G}$ is given by Observation 11.

Observation 11 *Let $G \in \mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{D} \cup \mathcal{D}_b \cup \mathcal{G}$ have order n. Then, G is a connected graph with $\delta(G) = 2$. Further, $\gamma_t^d(G) = (n+1)/2$ if $G \in \{C_3, C_7\}$, $\gamma_t^d(G) = n/2$ if $G \in \{C_4, C_6, C_8, C_{12}, B_3, D_b(4,4), D_b(3,4,1), D_b(3,3,2)\}$ and $\gamma_t^d(G) = (n-1)/2$ otherwise.*

3.1 $\frac{1}{2}$-Minimal Graphs

In order to prove our two main results, we study so-called $\frac{1}{2}$-minimal graphs. A graph G is *$\frac{1}{2}$-minimal graph* if G is edge-minimal with respect to the following three conditions: (i) $\delta(G) \geq 2$, (ii) G is connected, and (iii) $\gamma_t^d(G) \geq (n-1)/2$, where n is the order of G. If G is edge-minimal with respect to conditions (i) and (ii) but does not necessarily satisfy condition (iii) we refer to G as an *edge-minimal graph*. Thus if G is an edge-minimal graph and $e \in E(G)$, then $\delta(G-e) = 1$ or $G - e$ is disconnected. It is evident that, an edge-minimal graph which satisfies condition (iii) is a $\frac{1}{2}$-minimal graph.

As an immediate consequence of Proposition 8, 9 and 10, we obtain a characterization of the $\frac{1}{2}$-minimal graphs that are cycles, daisies and dumb-bells.

Corollary 12 *Let G be a $\frac{1}{2}$-minimal graph. Then the following holds.*
(a) *G is a cycle if and only if $G \in \mathcal{C}$.*
(b) *G is a daisy if and only if $G \in \mathcal{D}$.*
(c) *G is a dumb-bell if and only if $G \in \mathcal{D}_b \cup \mathcal{G}_b$.*

We next establish properties of graphs in the family $\mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{D} \cup \mathcal{D}_b \cup \mathcal{G}$.

Observation 13 *Each graph in $\mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{D} \cup \mathcal{D}_b \cup \mathcal{G}$ is a $\frac{1}{2}$-minimal graph.*

Recall that an edge e in a graph G is a good-edge of G if there is a $\gamma_t^d(G)$-set which contains both ends of e; otherwise, it is a bad-edge.

Observation 14 *Let $G \in \mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{D} \cup \mathcal{D}_b \cup \mathcal{G}$. Then every edge of G is a good-edge of G unless $G \in \{D(4,4), D_b(3,4), D_b(3,3,1)\} \cup \mathcal{G} \setminus \mathcal{G}_1$. Furthermore, if e is a bad-edge of G, then the following holds.*
(a) *If $G = D(4,4)$, then e is not incident with the vertex of degree 4 in G.*
(b) *If $G = D_b(3,4)$, then e is not incident with a vertex of degree 3 in G.*
(c) *If $G = D_b(3,3,1)$, then e is a cycle edge of G.*
(d) *If $G \in \mathcal{G} \setminus \mathcal{G}_1$, then e is incident with the identified vertex of G.*

Recall that a vertex v in a graph G is a good-vertex of G if it belongs to some $\gamma_t^d(G)$-set; otherwise, it is a bad-vertex of G.

Observation 15 *Let $G \in \mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{D} \cup \mathcal{D}_b \cup \mathcal{G}$. Then every vertex of G is a good-vertex of G unless $G \in \{D(4,4), D_b(3,4), D_b(3,3,1)\} \cup \mathcal{G}_0$. Furthermore, if v is a bad-vertex of G, then the following holds.*
(a) *If $G \in \mathcal{G}_0$, then v is the identified vertex of G.*
(b) *If $G \in \{D(4,4), D_b(3,4), D_b(3,3,1)\}$, then v is a vertex at distance 2 from the central vertex of G.*

The following observation establishes a property of good-graphs which are not dumb-bells.

Observation 16 *If $G \in \mathcal{G}$ and v is the identified vertex of G, then there is a $\gamma_t^d(G)$-set, S, such that $v \notin S$ and $N(v) \subset S$. Further if $G \notin \mathcal{G}_1$, then S can be chosen to totally dominate $N(v)$.*

The following observation characterizes the $\frac{1}{2}$-minimal graphs of small order.

Observation 17 *If G is a $\frac{1}{2}$-minimal graph of order n, $3 \leq n \leq 7$, then $G \in \{B_1, B_2, C_3, C_4, C_5, C_6, D(3,3), D(4,4), D_b(3,4), D_b(3,3,1)\} \subset \mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{D} \cup \mathcal{D}_b$.*

3.2 Near Disjunctive Total Dominating Sets

Let G be a graph and let v be a vertex of G. We denote the graph obtained from G by adding a new vertex v' and adding the pendant edge vv' by G^v. We define a *near-disjunctive total dominating set*, abbreviated NDTD-set, of G^v to be a set S of vertices in G^v such that

$v' \in S$ and every vertex in $V(G)$ is DT-dominated by the set S in G^v. We observe that if S is a NDTD-set of G^v, then possibly the vertex v' may not be DT-dominated by S. The *near-disjunctive total domination number*, $\gamma^d_{nt}(G^v)$, of G^v is the minimum cardinality of a NDTD-set in G^v. A NDTD-set of cardinality $\gamma^d_{nt}(G^v)$ is called a $\gamma^d_{nt}(G^v)$-set.

We say that a vertex v of an edge-minimal graph G is *special* if for every edge $e = uv$ incident with v we have that $G - e$ is disconnected or $d_G(u) = 2$. In particular, we note that if v is a special-vertex of G, then $\delta(G - v) = 1$ or $G - v$ is disconnected. The special vertices of each graph in the family $\mathcal{B}$ are indicated in Figure 8.

We present next two observations that establish useful properties of graphs that belong to the family $\mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{D} \cup \mathcal{D}_b \cup \mathcal{G}$.

Observation 18 *Let $G \in \mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{D} \cup \mathcal{D}_b \cup \mathcal{G}$ and let v be a special vertex of G. Then, $\gamma^d_{nt}(G^v) \leq \gamma^d_t(G)$, unless one of the following four conditions hold.*
(a) *$G \in \{C_4, C_5\}$.*
(b) *$G = B_1$ and v has degree 3 in G.*
(c) *$G \in \mathcal{G}$ and v is the identified vertex of G.*
(d) *$G \in \mathcal{G}_0$ and v is a neighbor of the identified vertex of G.*

Observation 19 *Let $G \in \mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{D} \cup \mathcal{D}_b \cup \mathcal{G}$ and let v be a special vertex of G. Let v' be the vertex added to G when constructing G^v. If $\gamma^d_{nt}(G^v) \leq \gamma^d_t(G)$, then there exists a $\gamma^d_{nt}(G^v)$-set that DT-dominates v' unless one of the following two conditions hold.*
(a) *$G = D(4, 4)$ and v is at distance 2 from the vertex of degree 4 in G.*
(b) *$G \in \{D_b(3, 4), D_b(3, 3, 1)\}$, $d_G(v) = 3$, and v belongs to a 3-cycle in G.*

4 Proof of Main Results

In this section, we present a proof of our main results, namely Theorem 5 and Theorem 6. We begin with a characterization of $\frac{1}{2}$-minimal graphs.

4.1 A Characterization of $\frac{1}{2}$-Minimal Graphs

A key result to enable us to prove our main results is the following characterization of $\frac{1}{2}$-minimal graphs.

Theorem 20 *A graph G is $\frac{1}{2}$-minimal if and only if $G \in \mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{D} \cup \mathcal{D}_b \cup \mathcal{G}$.*

Proof of Theorem 19. The sufficiency follows from Observation 13. To prove the necessity, we proceed by induction on the order $n \geq 3$ of a $\frac{1}{2}$-minimal graph. By Observation 17, the result is true for $n \leq 7$. Suppose $n \geq 8$, and assume that the result is true for all $\frac{1}{2}$-minimal graphs G' of order n', where $3 \leq n' < n$. Let $G = (V, E)$ be a $\frac{1}{2}$-minimal

graph of order n. We first present two useful observations. If e is an edge of G, then $\gamma_t^d(G-e) \geq \gamma_t^d(G)$. Hence, by the minimality of G, we have the following observation.

Observation 21 *If $e \in E$, then either e is a bridge of G or $\delta(G-e) = 1$.*

Since the disjunctive total domination number cannot decrease if edges are removed, the next observation follows as a consequence of the inductive hypothesis.

Observation 22 *If G' is a connected subgraph of G of order $n' < n$ with $\delta(G') \geq 2$, then either $G' \in \mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{D} \cup \mathcal{D}_b \cup \mathcal{G}$ or $\gamma_t^d(G') \leq (n-2)/2$.*

We now return to the proof of Theorem 20. Suppose $G = C_n$ (and still $n \geq 8$). Then, by Corollary 12, $G \in \mathcal{C}$. Hence we may assume G is not a cycle. Let $\mathcal{L}$ be the set of all large vertices of G and let $\mathcal{S}$ be the set of small vertices in G, i.e., $\mathcal{L} = \{v \in V \mid d_G(v) \geq 3\}$ and $\mathcal{S} = \{v \in V \mid d_G(v) = 2\}$. Since G is not a cycle, $|\mathcal{L}| \geq 1$. If $|\mathcal{L}| = 1$, then G is a daisy, and by Corollary 12(b), $G \in \mathcal{D}$. Hence, we may assume $|\mathcal{L}| \geq 2$. Further, if $|\mathcal{L}| = 2$ and G is a dumb-bell, then by Corollary 12(c), $G \in \mathcal{D}_b \cup \mathcal{G}_b$. Hence, we may assume that if $|\mathcal{L}| = 2$, then G is not a dumb-bell.

Let C be any component of $G - \mathcal{L}$; it is a path. If C has only one vertex, or has at least two vertices but the ends of C are adjacent in G to different large vertices, then we say that C is a 2-*path*. Otherwise we say that C is a 2-*handle*.

Lemma 23 *If $\mathcal{L}$ is not an independent set, then $G \in \{B_{10}, D_b(3,4), D_b(4,4)\} \cup \mathcal{G}$.*

Proof of Lemma 23. Suppose that $\mathcal{L}$ is not an independent set. Let u and v be two adjacent vertices in $\mathcal{L}$ and let $e = uv$. By Observation 21, e is a bridge. Let $G_1 = (V_1, E_1)$ and $G_2 = (V_2, E_2)$ be the two components of $G - e$, where $u \in V_1$. For $i = 1, 2$, let $|V_i| = n_i$, and so $n = n_1 + n_2$. Since $u, v \in \mathcal{L}$ in G, we note that $\delta(G_1) \geq 2$ and $\delta(G_2) \geq 2$. Hence, by Observation 22, for $i = 1, 2$, either $\gamma_t^d(G_i) \leq (n_i - 2)/2$ or $G_i \in \mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{D} \cup \mathcal{D}_b \cup \mathcal{G}$. If $\gamma_t^d(G_i) \leq (n_i - 1)/2$ for $i = 1, 2$, then, $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq (n_1 - 1)/2 + (n_2 - 1)/2 = (n-2)/2$, a contradiction. Hence we may assume that $\gamma_t^d(G_1) \geq n_1/2$. By Observation 11, if $\gamma_t^d(G_1) > n_1/2$, then $G_1 \in \{C_3, C_7\}$ and if $\gamma_t^d(G) = n_1/2$, then $G_1 \in \{C_4, C_6, C_8, C_{12}\} \cup \{B_3, D_b(4,4), D_b(3,4,1), D_b(3,3,2)\}$.

Let N_v denote the set of neighbors of v in G_2, and so $N_v = N_G(v) \setminus \{u\}$. If $V(G_2) = N_v \cup \{v\}$, then $\{u, v\}$ is a DTD-set of G, and so recalling that $n \geq 8$, $\gamma_t^d(G) = 2 < (n-2)/2$, a contradiction. Hence, $V(G_2) \neq N_v \cup \{v\}$. We proceed further with the following series of claims.

Claim A *If $G_1 = C_3$, then $G \in \mathcal{G}_3 \cup \mathcal{G}_5$.*

Proof of Claim A. Suppose that $G_1 = C_3$. Since G is not a dumb-bell, the graph G_2 is not a cycle. The vertex v has at least two neighbors in G_2, and so $|N_v| \geq 2$. Further, every vertex in $V(G_2) \setminus N[v]$ has degree at least 2 in $G_2 - v$.

Claim A.1 *The set N_v is an independent set in G.*

Proof of Claim A.1 Suppose, to the contrary, that x_1 and x_2 are two adjacent vertices in N_v. If x_1 and x_2 are both large vertices, let $f = x_1x_2$, while if x_1 is a large vertex and x_2 is a small vertex, let $f = vx_1$. In both cases, $G - f$ is connected and $\delta(G - f) \geq 2$, contradicting the edge-minimality of G. Hence, both x_1 and x_2 are small vertices. Thus, G contains a 2-handle C with $|C| = 2$ and with both ends of C adjacent to v. Since $V(G_2) \neq N_v \cup \{v\}$, we observe that $|N_v| \geq 3$ and $d_G(v) \geq 4$. Let $H = G - \{x_1, x_2\}$. The degree of each vertex in H different from v remains unchanged from its degree in G, and so H is a connected graph with $\delta(H) \geq 2$. Further, H is edge-minimal. Let H have order $n_H = n - 2$. By Observation 22, $H \in \mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{D} \cup \mathcal{D}_b \cup \mathcal{G}$ or $\gamma_t^d(H) \leq (n_H - 2)/2$.

Suppose $\gamma_t^d(H) \leq (n_H - 2)/2$. Every $\gamma_t^d(H)$-set can be extended to a DTD-set of G by adding to it the vertex v, implying that $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq \gamma_t^d(H) + 1 \leq (n_H - 2)/2 + 1 = (n-2)/2$, a contradiction. Hence, $H \in \mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{D} \cup \mathcal{D}_b \cup \mathcal{G}$. Since G_1 is a subgraph of H, we note that H is not a cycle. Therefore by Observation 11, $\gamma_t^d(H) \leq n_H/2$. If v is a good-vertex of H, then a $\gamma_t^d(H)$-set that contains v is a DTD-set of G, implying that $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq \gamma_t^d(H) \leq n_H/2 = (n-2)/2$, a contradiction. Therefore, v is a bad-vertex of H. By Observation 11, either $H \in \{D(4,4), D_b(3,4), D_b(3,3,1)\}$ and v is a vertex at distance 2 from the central vertex of H or $H \in \mathcal{G}_0$ and v is the identified vertex of H. In both cases, G_1 is not a subgraph of H, a contradiction. (□)

Claim A.2 *If N_v contains two small vertices in G, then these two vertices have only v as their common neighbor.*

Proof of Claim A.2 Suppose, to the contrary, that w_1 and w_2 are two small vertices (of degree 2) in N_v and that $N(w_1) = N(w_2) = \{v, x\}$. Suppose that $d_G(x) = 2$. In this case we consider the connected graph $H = G - \{w_1, w_2, x\}$. Let H have order $n_H = n - 3$. Since G is not a dumb-bell, $d_H(v) \geq 2$ and H is edge-minimal. Further since H is not a cycle, $\gamma_t^d(H) \leq n_H/2$. Since G_1 is a subgraph of H, we can choose a $\gamma_t^d(H)$-set to contain u and v or to contain u and at least two vertices in N_v. In both cases, such a $\gamma_t^d(H)$-set can be extended to a DTD-set of G by adding to it the vertex w_1, implying that $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq \gamma_t^d(H) + 1$. If $\gamma_t^d(H) \leq (n_H - 1)/2$, then $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq (n-2)/2$, a contradiction. Hence, $\gamma_t^d(H) = n_H/2$, implying by Observation 11 and our earlier observations, that $H = D_b(3,4,1)$ or $H = D_b(3,3,2)\}$. In both cases, $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq 4 = (n-2)/2$, a contradiction. Hence, $d_G(x) \geq 3$.

We now consider the graph $H = G - w_1$. The degree of each vertex in H different from v and x remains unchanged from its degree in G. Further, $d_H(v) \geq 2$ and $d_H(x) \geq 2$, and so H is a connected graph with $\delta(H) \geq 2$, implying that H is edge-minimal. Let H have order $n_H = n - 1$. Since G_1 is a subgraph of H, we can choose a $\gamma_t^d(H)$-set to contain u and v or to contain u and at least two vertices in N_v. Such a $\gamma_t^d(H)$-set is a DTD-set of G, implying that $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq \gamma_t^d(H)$. Since H is not a cycle, $\gamma_t^d(H) \leq n_H/2$. If $\gamma_t^d(H) \leq (n_H - 1)/2$, then $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq (n-2)/2$, a contradiction. Hence, $\gamma_t^d(H) = n_H/2$, implying by Observation 11 and our earlier observations, that $H = D_b(3,3,2)$. But then $\{u, w_1, w_2\}$ is a DTD-set in G, and so $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq 3 = (n-3)/2$, a contradiction. (□)

Among all vertices in N_v, let w be one of minimum degree. We note that $d_{G_2-v}(w) \geq 1$. Let G_2^* be the graph obtained from $G_2 - v$ by adding as few edges as possible joining w to vertices in N_v so that the resulting graph is connected and has minimum degree at least 2. We note that by Claim A.1 and Claim A.2, and by the fact that G is edge-minimal, the graph G_2^* is edge-minimal. By the inductive hypothesis, $G_2^* \in \mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{D} \cup \mathcal{D}_b \cup \mathcal{G}$ or $\gamma_t^d(G_2^*) \leq (n_2^* - 2)/2$. Let S^* be a $\gamma_t^d(G_2^*)$-set.

Claim A.3 $G_2^* \in \mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{D} \cup \mathcal{D}_b \cup \mathcal{G}$.

Proof of Claim A.3 Suppose $\gamma_t^d(G_2^*) \leq (n_2^*-2)/2 = (n-6)/2$. If $w \in S^*$ or if $S^* \cap N_v = \emptyset$, let $S = S^* \cup \{u, v\}$. If $w \notin S^*$ and $|S^* \cap N_v| \geq 1$, let $S = S^* \cup \{u, w\}$. We show that S is a DTD-set in G. Suppose that there is a vertex x in G that is not DT-dominated by the set S. Then, x has no neighbor in S and is at distance 2 from at most one vertex of S in G. If $x = u$, then $v \notin S$, implying that $S = S^* \cup \{u, w\}$. In this case, $|S \cap N_v| \geq 2$ and therefore x is at distance 2 from at least two vertices of S, a contradiction. Hence, $x \neq u$. Since $u \in S$, we have that $x \notin N(u)$, and so $x \in V(G_2^*)$. Suppose $x \in N_v$. Then, $v \notin S$, implying that $w \in S$, $w \notin S^*$ and $|S^* \cap N_v| \geq 1$. Let $w^* \in S^* \cap N_v$. If $x \neq w$, then x is at distance 2 from both u and w. If $x = w$, then x is at distance 2 from both u and w^*. In both cases, x is at distance 2 from at least two vertices of S, a contradiction. Hence, $x \notin N_v$. Thus, the neighbors of x in G and G_2^* are the same. Since $S^* \subset S$ and x has no neighbor in S, the vertex x has no neighbor in S^*. However, S^* is a DTD-set of G_2^*, implying that x is at distance 2 from at least two vertices of S^* in G_2^*. Since x is at distance 2 from at most one vertex of S in G and since $S^* \subset S$, there is a vertex $x^* \in S^*$ at distance 2 from x in G_2^* but at distance greater than 2 from x in G. This is only possible if w is the only common neighbor of x and x^* in G_2^* and if wx^* was an edge added to $G_2 - v$ when forming G_2^*. Therefore, $x^* \in S^* \cap N_v$ and $x^* \neq w$. In particular, we note that $w \notin S^*$ and $|S^* \cap N_v| \geq 1$. But then $w \in S$, implying that x has a neighbor in S, a contradiction. Therefore, S is a DTD-set in G. Thus, $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq |S| = |S^*| + 2 = \gamma_t^d(G_2^*) + 2 \leq (n-6)/2 + 2 = (n-2)/2$, a contradiction. Hence, $G_2^* \in \mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{D} \cup \mathcal{D}_b \cup \mathcal{G}$. (□)

Claim A.4 *At least one edge was added to $G_2 - v$ when forming G_2^*.*

Proof of Claim A.4 On the one hand, suppose that $d_G(w) = 2$. Then, $d_{G_2-v}(w) = 1$ and therefore at least one new edge incident with w was added to $G_2 - v$ to guarantee that $\delta(G_2^*) \geq 2$. On the other hand, suppose that $d_G(w) \geq 3$. By our choice of w, every neighbor of v in G_2 has degree at least 3 in G in this case. If $G_2 - v$ is connected, then removing from G an arbitrary edge joining v with a vertex in N_v produces a connected graph with minimum degree 2, contradicting the edge-minimality of G. Hence, $G_2 - v$ is disconnected. Therefore at least one new edge incident with w was added to $G_2 - v$ to guarantee that G_2^* is connected. (□)

By Claim A.4, at least one edge was added to $G_2 - v$ when forming G_2^*. Let $f = wx$ be such an added edge. We note that $\{w, x\} \subseteq N_v$.

Claim A.5 $G_2^* \in \mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{D} \cup \mathcal{D}_b \cup \mathcal{G}$.

Proof of Claim A.5 By Claim A.3, $G_2^* \in \mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{D} \cup \mathcal{D}_b \cup \mathcal{G}$. Suppose that $G_2^* \in \mathcal{C}$. Then the edge f was the only edge added to $G_2 - v$ when forming G_2^*, and so $G_2 - v$ is a path whose ends, namely w and x, are both adjacent to v in G_2. By the edge-minimality of G, the vertex v is adjacent to no other vertex on this path, implying that G_2 is a cycle and therefore G is a dumb-bell, a contradiction. (□)

Claim A.4 *The edge f is a bad-edge in G_2^*.*

Proof of Claim A.6 Suppose to the contrary that f is a good-edge in G_2^*. Then the $\gamma_t^d(G_2^*)$-set, S^*, can be chosen to contain both w and x. With this choice of S^*, let $S = S^* \cup \{u\}$. Then, S is a DTD-set of G, and so $\gamma_t^d(G) \le |S| + 1 = \gamma_t^d(G_2^*) + 1$. By Observation 11 and Claim A.5, we have that $\gamma_t^d(G_2^*) \le n_2^*/2 = (n-4)/2$, implying that $\gamma_t^d(G) \le (n-2)/2$, a contradiction. (□)

Claim A.7 $G_2^* \in \mathcal{G} \setminus \mathcal{G}_1$.

Proof of Claim A.7 By Claim A.6, the edge f is a bad-edge in G_2^*. By Observation 14 and Claim A.3, we have that $G_2^* \in \{D(4,4), D_b(3,4), D_b(3,3,1)\} \cup \mathcal{G} \setminus \mathcal{G}_1$. Suppose to the contrary that $G_2^* \in \{D(4,4), D_b(3,4), D_b(3,3,1)\}$. Then, by Observation 14 and by the edge-minimality of G and the construction of G_2^*, the edge f was the only edge added to $G_2 - v$ when forming G_2^*. The graph G is therefore determined and has order $n = 11$, and it can be readily checked that $\gamma_t^d(G) = 4 < (n-1)/2$, a contradiction. (□)

By Claim A.6, the edge f is a bad-edge in G_2^*. By Claim A.7, we have that $G_2^* \in \mathcal{G} \setminus \mathcal{G}_1$. Let v^* be the identified vertex of G_2^*. By Observation 14(d), the edge f is incident with the vertex v^*.

Claim A.8 $G_2^* \in \mathcal{G}_0$.

Proof of Claim A.8 Suppose to the contrary that $G_2^* \notin \mathcal{G}_0$. Then, $G_2^* \in \mathcal{G}_i$ for some i, $2 \le i \le 6$. Let x^* be the neighbor of v^* that belongs to the X_i-unit in G_2^*. By Observation 15, the vertex v^* is a good-vertex of G_2^*. Thus the $\gamma_t^d(G_2^*)$-set, S^*, can be chosen to contain v^*. Further, in each unit of type-1 or type-2 in G_2^*, we can choose S^* to contain the neighbor of v^* in that unit as well as a vertex at distance 2 from v^* is that unit. If v is not adjacent to x^* in G, then the set $S^* \cup \{u\}$ is a DTD-set of G, implying that $\gamma_t^d(G) \le |S^*| + 1 = \gamma_t^d(G_2^*) + 1 = (n_2^* - 1)/2 + 1 = (n-3)/2$, a contradiction. Hence, vx^* is an edge of G. In this case, the set $(S^* \cup \{u, v\}) \setminus \{v^*\}$ is a DTD-set of G, implying that $\gamma_t^d(G) \le |S^*| + 1 = (n-3)/2$, a contradiction. (□)

By Claim A.8, $G_2^* \in \mathcal{G}_0$. The $\gamma_t^d(G_2^*)$-set, S^*, can be chosen to contain the neighbor of v^* in each unit of type-1 or type-2 in G_2^* as well as a vertex at distance 2 from v^* in each unit. By

the edge-minimality of G, and the way in which G_2^* is constructed, if z is a neighbor of v in G_2, then either $z = v^*$ or z is a neighbor of v^* in G_2^*. Thus if $d_{G_2}(v) \geq 3$, then the set $S^* \cup \{u\}$ is a DTD-set of G, implying that $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq |S^*|+1 = \gamma_t^d(G_2^*)+1 = (n_2^*-1)/2+1 = (n-3)/2$, a contradiction. Hence, $d_{G_2}(v) = 2$, implying that the ends of the edge f, namely w and x, are the only neighbors of v in G_2. As observed earlier, the edge f is incident with the vertex v^*. Let $\{u^*, v^*\} = \{w, x\}$. If u^* belongs to a type-1 unit in G_2^*, then $G \in \mathcal{G}_3$. If u^* belongs to a type-2 unit in G_2^*, then $G \in \mathcal{G}_5$. This completes the proof of Claim A. (□)

By Claim A, we may assume that $G_1 \neq C_3$, for otherwise the desired result follows. Analogously, we may assume that $G_2 \neq C_3$.

Claim B *$G_1 \neq C_7$.*

Proof of Claim B. Suppose to the contrary that $G_1 = C_7$. Then, $n = n_2 + 7$. Let G_1 be the cycle $uu_1u_2 \ldots u_6u$. By Observation 22, $\gamma_t^d(G_2) \leq (n_2 - 2)/2$ or $G_2 \in \mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{D} \cup \mathcal{D}_b \cup \mathcal{G}$. Let S be a $\gamma_t^d(G_2)$-set. Suppose that $\gamma_t^d(G_2) \leq (n_2 - 1)/2 = n/2 - 4$. Then the set $S \cup \{u_3, u_4, v\}$ is a DTD-set of G, implying that $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq \gamma_t^d(G_2) + 3 = n/2 - 1$, a contradiction. Hence, $\gamma_t^d(G_2) \geq n_2/2$ and $G_2 \in \mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{D} \cup \mathcal{D}_b \cup \mathcal{G}$. Since G is not a dumb-bell, the graph G_2 is not a cycle. Thus by Observation 11, $\gamma_t^d(G_2) = n_2/2$ and $G_2 \in \{B_3, D_b(4,4), D_b(3,4,1), D_b(3,3,2)\}$. By Observation 15, every vertex of G_2 is a good-vertex. In particular, the vertex v is a good-vertex of G_2. Choosing the $\gamma_t^d(G_2)$-set, S, to contain the vertex v, we have that the set $S \cup \{u_3, u_4\}$ is a DTD-set of G, implying that $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq |S| + 2 = \gamma_t^d(G_2) + 2 = n_2/2 + 2 = (n-3)/2$, a contradiction. (□)

By Claim B, we have $G_1 \neq C_7$. Analogously, we have $G_2 \neq C_7$. Since $G_1 \notin \{C_3, C_7\}$, we have that $\gamma_t^d(G) = n_1/2$ and $G_1 \in \{C_4, C_6, C_8, C_{12}\} \cup \{B_3, D_b(4,4), D_b(3,4,1), D_b(3,3,2)\}$. If $\gamma_t^d(G_2) \leq (n_2 - 2)/2$, then $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq \gamma_t^d(G_1) + \gamma_t^d(G_2) \leq n_1/2 + (n_2 - 2)/2 = (n-2)/2$, a contradiction. Hence, $\gamma_t^d(G_2) \geq (n_2 - 1)/2$. By Observation 22, $G_2 \in \mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{D} \cup \mathcal{D}_b \cup \mathcal{G}$. By our earlier assumptions and observations, $G_2 \notin \{C_3, C_7\}$, implying that $\gamma_t^d(G_2) \leq n_2/2$.

Claim C *If $G_1 = C_4$, then $G = B_{10}$ or $G \in \mathcal{G}$.*

Proof of Claim C. Suppose that $G_1 = C_4$. Then, $n = n_2 + 4$. As observed earlier, $G_2 \notin \{C_3, C_7\}$ and $G_2 \in \mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{D} \cup \mathcal{D}_b \cup \mathcal{G}$. Since G is not a dumb-bell, the graph G_2 is not a cycle. Thus, $G_2 \notin \mathcal{C}$, and so $G_2 \in \mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{D} \cup \mathcal{D}_b \cup \mathcal{G}$. By the edge-minimality of G, the vertex v is a special vertex in G_2. Recall that the graph G_2^v is obtained from G_2 by adding a new vertex v' and adding the pendant edge vv'.

Suppose $\gamma_{nt}^d(G_2^v) \leq \gamma_t^d(G_2)$. Let S_2 be a $\gamma_{nt}^d(G_2^v)$-set. Let u_1 be a neighbor of u in G_1. Then the set $(S_2 \setminus \{v'\}) \cup \{u, u_1\}$ is a DTD-set of G, and so $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq |S_2|+1 = \gamma_{nt}^d(G_2^v)+1 \leq \gamma_t^d(G_2) + 1 \leq n_2/2 + 1 = (n-2)/2$, a contradiction. Hence, $\gamma_{nt}^d(G_2^v) > \gamma_t^d(G_2)$. Applying Observation 18 to the graph G_2 and the special vertex v of G_2, one of the three conditions (b), (c) or (d) in the statement of the observation hold. We consider each of the three conditions in turn.

If $G_2 = B_1$ and v has degree 3 in G_2, then $G = B_{10}$. If $G_2 \in \mathcal{G}$ and v is the identified vertex of G_2, then $G \in \mathcal{G}$ and G has one additional type-2 unit than does G_2. Suppose $G_2 \in \mathcal{G}_0$ and v is a neighbor of the identified vertex of G_2. Then, $G_2 = G_0(i, j)$ for some i, j where $i + j \geq 2$ and either v belongs to a type-1 unit or a type-2 unit of G_2. If v belongs to a type-1 unit of G_2, then $G \in G_5(i-1, j) \in \mathcal{G}_5$. If v belongs to a type-2 unit of G_2, then $G \in G_6(i, j-1) \in \mathcal{G}_6$. Hence if $G_2 \in \mathcal{G}_0$, then $G \in \mathcal{G}$. (□)

By Claim C, we may assume that $G_1 \neq C_4$, for otherwise the desired result follows. Analogously, we may assume that $G_2 \neq C_4$. By the edge-minimality of G, the vertex u is a special vertex in G_1 and the vertex v is a special vertex in G_2. Recall that the graph G_1^u is obtained from G_1 by adding a new vertex u' and adding the pendant edge uu'. By our earlier observations, $G_1 \in \{C_6, C_8, C_{12}\} \cup \{B_3, D_b(4,4), D_b(3,4,1), D_b(3,3,2)\}$. Further, $G_2 \notin \{C_3, C_4, C_7\}$ and $G_2 \in \mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{D} \cup \mathcal{D}_b \cup \mathcal{G}$.

Claim D *$G_2 \in \mathcal{G}_0$ and that v is the identified vertex of G_2.*

Proof of Claim D. Suppose that v is a good-vertex of G_2. Let S_2 be a $\gamma_t^d(G_2)$-set that contains the vertex v. By Observation 18, we have that $\gamma_{nt}^d(G_1^u) \leq \gamma_t^d(G_1)$. Let S_1 be a $\gamma_{nt}^d(G_1^u)$-set and note that $u' \in S_1$. Then the set $(S_1 \setminus \{u'\}) \cup S_2$ is a DTD-set of G, and so $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq |S_1| + |S_2| - 1 = \gamma_{nt}^d(G_1^u) + \gamma_t^d(G_2) - 1 \leq \gamma_t^d(G_1) + \gamma_t^d(G_2) - 1 \leq n_1/2 + n_2/2 - 1 = (n-2)/2$, a contradiction. Hence, v is a bad-vertex of G_2. Applying Observation 15 to the graph G_2, we have that $G_2 \in \{D(4,4), D_b(3,4), D_b(3,3,1)\}$ or $G_2 \in \mathcal{G}_0$. Further, if $G_2 \in \mathcal{G}_0$, then v is the identified vertex of G_2.

By Observation 15, every vertex of G_1 is a good-vertex of G_1. Let D_1 be a $\gamma_t^d(G_1)$-set that contains the vertex u. Suppose that $\gamma_{nt}^d(G_2^v) \leq \gamma_t^d(G_2)$. Let D_2 be a $\gamma_{nt}^d(G_2^v)$-set. Then the set $D_1 \cup (D_2 \setminus \{v'\})$ is a DTD-set of G, and so $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq |D_1| + |D_2| - 1 \leq \gamma_t^d(G_1) + \gamma_{nt}^d(G_2^v) - 1 \leq \gamma_t^d(G_1) + \gamma_t^d(G_2) - 1 \leq n_1/2 + n_2/2 - 1 = (n-2)/2$, a contradiction. Hence, $\gamma_{nt}^d(G_2^v) > \gamma_t^d(G_2)$. By Observation 18, we therefore have that $G_2 \notin \{D(4,4), D_b(3,4), D_b(3,3,1)\}$, implying that $G_2 \in \mathcal{G}_0$ and that v is the identified vertex of G_2. (□)

We now return to the proof of Lemma 23 one last time. By Claim D, $G_2 \in \mathcal{G}_0$ and v is the identified vertex of G_2. Let S_1 be a $\gamma_{nt}^d(G_1^u)$-set and note that $u' \in S_1$. Let S_2 be a $\gamma_t^d(G_2)$-set that contains all neighbors of v in G_2 and a vertex at distance 2 from v in each unit of G_2. Then, $\gamma_t^d(G_2) = |S_2| = (n_2 - 1)/2$. As observed earlier, we have that $G_1 \in \{C_6, C_8, C_{12}, B_3, D_b(4,4),\ D_b(3,4,1), D_b(3,3,2)\}$. We consider the seven possibilities in turn.

If $G = C_6$, then $G \in \mathcal{G}_2$.

If $G_1 = C_8$, let G_1 be given by $uu_1u_2 \ldots u_7u$. Then the set $S_2 \cup \{u, u_3, u_4\}$ is a DTD-set of G, and so $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq |S_2| + 3 = \gamma_t^d(G_1) + \gamma_t^d(G_2) - 1 = n_1/2 + (n_2 - 1)/2 - 1 = (n-3)/2$, a contradiction. Hence, $G_1 \neq C_8$.

Suppose $G_1 \in \{C_{12}, B_3\}$. Then, $\gamma_{nt}^d(G_1^u) = \gamma_t^d(G_1) - 1$. The set $(S_1 \setminus \{u'\}) \cup (S_2 \cup \{v\})$ is a DTD-set of G, and so $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq |S_1| + |S_2| = \gamma_t^d(G_1) + \gamma_t^d(G_2) - 1 = n_1/2 + (n_2 - 1)/2 - 1 = (n-3)/2$, a contradiction. Hence, $G_1 \notin \{C_{12}, B_3\}$.

Suppose $G_1 = D_b(4,4)$. If u has degree 2 in G_1, then $\gamma^d_{nt}(G^u_1) = \gamma^d_t(G_1) - 1$, and as before we obtain a contradiction. Hence, $d_{G_1}(u) = 3$. But then $G \in \mathcal{G}_6$.

Suppose $G_1 = D_b(3,4,1)$. Then, G_1 can be obtained from a path $u_1u_2 \ldots u_8$ by adding the edges u_1u_3 and u_5u_8. Since u is a special vertex of G_1, we note that $u \in \{u_3, u_4, u_5, u_7\}$. If $u = u_3$, let $S = S_2 \cup \{u_3, u_5, u_6\}$. If $u = u_7$, let $S = S_2 \cup \{u_3, u_4, u_5\}$. In both cases, S is a DTD-set of G, and so $\gamma^d_t(G) \le |S| = |S_2| + 3 = \gamma^d_t(G_1) + \gamma^d_t(G_2) - 1 = (n-3)/2$, a contradiction. Hence, $u \in \{u_4, u_5\}$. If $u = u_4$, then $G \in \mathcal{G}_5$. If $u = u_5$, then $G \in \mathcal{G}_4$.

Suppose $G_1 = D_b(3,3,2)$. Then, G_1 can be obtained from a path $u_1u_2 \ldots u_8$ by adding the edges u_1u_3 and u_6u_8. Since u is a special vertex of G_1, we note that $u \in \{u_3, u_4, u_5, u_6\}$. By symmetry, we may assume that $u \in \{u_3, u_4\}$. If $u = u_3$, then $S_2 \cup \{u_3, u_5, u_6\}$ is a DTD-set of G, and so $\gamma^d_t(G) \le |S_2| + 3 = \gamma^d_t(G_1) + \gamma^d_t(G_2) - 1 = (n-3)/2$, a contradiction. Hence, $u = u_4$. But then $G \in \mathcal{G}_3$.

Hence we have shown that $G_1 \in \{C_6, D_b(4,4),\ D_b(3,4,1), D_b(3,3,2)\}$ and that $G \in \mathcal{G}$. This completes the proof of Lemma 23. □

By Lemma 23, we may assume that $\mathcal{L}$ is not an independent set, for otherwise the desired result follows.

Lemma 24 *If G contains a path on six vertices each internal vertex of which has degree 2 in G and whose end vertices are not adjacent, then $G \in \{B_3, B_4, B_5, B_7, B_{11}\}$.*

Proof of Lemma 24. Let u and v be non-adjacent vertices in G joined by a path $uw_1w_2w_3w_4v$ every internal vertex of which has degree 2 in G. Let G' be the graph obtained from G by removing the vertices w_1, w_2, w_3 and w_4, and adding the edge uv. Then, G' is a connected graph of order $n' = n-4$ with $\delta(G') \ge 2$. By Observation 7, $\gamma^d_t(G) \le \gamma^d_t(G') + 2$. It follows that if $\gamma^d_t(G') \le (n'-2)/2$, then $\gamma^d_t(G) \le (n-6)/2 + 2 = (n-2)/2$, a contradiction. Hence, $\gamma^d_t(G') \ge (n'-1)/2$. Let $F = G' - e$. Then, F has order n' and either F is disconnected or $\delta(F) = 1$ or F is connected and $\delta(F) \ge 2$.

Claim E *If F is disconnected or $\delta(F) = 1$, then $G \in \{B_5, B_{11}\} \subset \mathcal{B}$.*

Proof of Claim E. Assume that F is disconnected or $\delta(F) = 1$. Then, G' is an edge-minimal graph. As observed earlier, $\gamma^d_t(G') \ge (n'-1)/2$. Thus, G' is a $\frac{1}{2}$-minimal graph. Applying the induction hypothesis to the graph G', we see that $G' \in \mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{D} \cup \mathcal{D}_b \cup \mathcal{G}$. If $G' \in \mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{D} \cup \mathcal{D}_b \cup \mathcal{G}_b$, then $G \in \mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{D} \cup \mathcal{D}_b \cup \mathcal{G}_b$, contradicting our previous assumptions. Hence, $G' \in \mathcal{B} \cup (\mathcal{G} \setminus \mathcal{G}_b)$.

Claim E.1 $G' \in \mathcal{B}$.

Proof of Claim E. Suppose to the contrary that $G' \notin \mathcal{B}$. Then, $G' \in \mathcal{G} \setminus \mathcal{G}_b$. Let x be the identified vertex of G. Suppose that $G' \in \mathcal{G}_0$, and so $G' = G_0(n_1, n_2)$ for some $n_1 \ge 0$ and

$n_2 \geq 0$ where $n_1 + n_2 \geq 2$. Since $G' \notin \mathcal{G}_b$, we note that $n_1 + n_2 \geq 3$. By Observation 16, there is a $\gamma_t^d(G')$-set, S', such that $v \notin S'$, $N(v) \subset S'$ and S' totally dominates $N(v)$ in G'. In particular, we note that in each unit in G' there is exactly one vertex at distance 2 from x in G' that belongs to S'. If e is a bridge of G', then we may assume, renaming vertices if necessary, that x is incident with e and that $x = u$. In this case, we let $S = S' \cup \{w_1\}$. If e belongs to a 3-cycle in G', then renaming vertices, if necessary, we may assume that this 3-cycle is given by $zuvz$ and that xyz is a path in G'. In this case, we note that $\{y, z\} \subset S'$ and we let $S = (S \setminus \{z\}) \cup \{w_2, w_3\}$. If e belongs to a 4-cycle in G', then renaming vertices, if necessary, we may assume that this 4-cycle is given by $yuvzy$ and that xy is a path in G'. In this case, we may assume that $\{y, z\} \subset S'$ (since if $u \in S'$, we simply replace u in S' by z) and let $S = (S \setminus \{z\}) \cup \{w_2, w_3\}$. In all three cases, the set S is a DTD-set of G, and so $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq |S| + 1 = (n' - 1)/2 + 1 = (n - 3)/2$, a contradiction. Hence, $G' \notin \mathcal{G}_0$.

Suppose that $G' \in \mathcal{G}_1$, and so $G' = G_1(n_1, n_2)$ for some $n_1 \geq 0$ and $n_2 \geq 0$ where $n_1 + n_2 \geq 1$. Since $G' \notin \mathcal{G}_b$, we note that $n_1 + n_2 \geq 2$. By Observation 16, there is a $\gamma_t^d(G')$-set, S', such that $v \notin S'$ and $N(v) \subset S'$. Further we can choose such a set S' so that each unit in G' contains a vertex at distance 2 from x in G' that belongs to S'. If $n_2 \geq 1$, then since $\mathcal{L}$ is an independent set, we have that $n_2 = 1$ and that e is the edge that joins x to the vertex of the 4-cycle in G'. Renaming u and v, if necessary, we may assume that $u = x$. In this case, we let $S = S' \cup \{w_1\}$. Then, S is a DTD-set of G, and so $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq |S| + 1 = (n' - 1)/2 + 1 = (n - 3)/2$, a contradiction. Hence, $G' = G_1(n_1, 0)$ for some $n_1 \geq 2$. If e belongs to the 5-cycle in G', then we may assume, renaming vertices if necessary, that x is incident with e and that $x = u$. In this case, we note that $v \in S'$ and we let $S = (S' \setminus \{v\}) \cup \{w_3, w_4\}$. If e is a bridge of G, then we may assume, renaming vertices if necessary, that x is incident with e and that $x = u$. In this case, we let $S = S' \cup \{w_1\}$. If e belongs to a 3-cycle in G', then renaming vertices, if necessary, we may assume that this 3-cycle is given by $zuvz$ and that xyz is a path in G'. In this case, we note that $\{y, z\} \subset S'$ and we let $S = (S \setminus \{z\}) \cup \{w_2, w_3\}$. In all three cases, the set S is a DTD-set of G, and so $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq |S| + 1 = (n' - 1)/2 + 1 = (n - 3)/2$, a contradiction. Hence, $G' \notin \mathcal{G}_1$.

Suppose that $G' \in \mathcal{G}_2$, and so $G' = G_2(n_1, n_2)$ for some $n_1 \geq 0$ and $n_2 \geq 0$ where $n_1 + n_2 \geq 1$. Since $G' \notin \mathcal{G}_b$, we note that $n_1 + n_2 \geq 2$. By Observation 16, there is a $\gamma_t^d(G')$-set, S', such that $v \notin S'$, $N(v) \subset S'$ and S' totally dominates $N(v)$ in G'. Since $\mathcal{L}$ is an independent set, e is the edge that joins x to the vertex of the 6-cycle in G'. Renaming u and v, if necessary, we may assume that $u = x$. Let $C\colon vv_1v_2v_3v_4v_5v$ be the 6-cycle in G'. We may choose S' so that $S \cap V(C) = \{v, v_1, v_5\}$. With this choice of the set S', the set $S' \cup \{w_4\}$ is a DTD-set of G, and so $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq |S'| + 1 = (n' - 1)/2 + 1 = (n - 3)/2$, a contradiction. Hence, $G' \notin \mathcal{G}_2$.

Suppose that $G' \in \mathcal{G}_3$. Since $\mathcal{L}$ is an independent set in G, either $G' = G_3(1, 0)$ or $G' = G_3(0, 1)$. In both cases, e is the edge joining the two vertices of degree 3 in G'. The graph G is therefore determined and has order $n = 17$ and $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq 7 = (n - 3)/2$, a contradiction. Hence, $G' \notin \mathcal{G}_3$.

Suppose that $G' \in \mathcal{G}_4$. Since $\mathcal{L}$ is an independent set in G, either $G' = G_4(1, 0)$ or $G' = G_4(0, 1)$. In both cases, G' has order $n' = 13$ and, up to isomorphism, there are five different choice for the edge e. This gives rise to a total of ten possible (non-isomorphic)

constructions for the graph G. However in all ten cases, we have $n = 17$ and $\gamma_t^d(G) \le 7 = (n-3)/2$, a contradiction. Hence, $G' \notin \mathcal{G}_4$.

If $G' \in \mathcal{G}_5$, then for every possible choice of the edge e, we will always produce two adjacent large vertices in G, contradicting our assumption that $\mathcal{L}$ is an independent set. Hence, $G' \notin \mathcal{G}_5$.

Suppose that $G' \in \mathcal{G}_6$. Since $\mathcal{L}$ is an independent set in G, either $G' = G_6(1,0)$ or $G' = G_6(0,1)$. In both cases, e is the edge joining the two large vertices in G'. The graph G is therefore determined and has order $n = 17$ and $\gamma_t^d(G) \le 7 = (n-3)/2$, a contradiction. Hence, $G' \notin \mathcal{G}_6$. (□)

Claim E.2 $G' \in \{B_1, B_5\}$.

Proof of Claim E. By Claim E.1, $G' \in \mathcal{B}$. We wish to show that $G' \in \{B_1, B_5\}$. Suppose to the contrary that $G' \notin \{B_1, B_5\}$.

Suppose that $G' = B_2$. Up to isomorphism, there are two different choices for the edge e. This gives rise to two possible (non-isomorphic) constructions for the graph G from the graph G'. However in both cases, we have $n = 11$ and $\gamma_t^d(G) \le 4 = (n-3)/2$, a contradiction.

Suppose that $G' = B_3$. Up to isomorphism, there are two different choices for the edge e. This gives rise to two possible (non-isomorphic) constructions for the graph G from the graph G'. However in both cases, we have $n = 12$ and $\gamma_t^d(G) \le 5 = (n-2)/2$, a contradiction.

Suppose that $G' \in \{B_4, B_6, B_7, B_8, B_9, B_{10}\}$. Then, $n' = 9$, and so $n = 13$. If $G' \in \{B_4, B_6, B_8\}$, then up to isomorphism, there are two different choices for the edge e. If $G' \in \{B_7, B_9, B_{10}\}$, then up to isomorphism, there are three different choices for the edge e. In all cases, the resulting graph G constructed from G' satisfies $\gamma_t^d(G) \le 5 = (n-3)/2$, a contradiction.

Suppose that $G' = B_{11}$. Up to isomorphism, there are two different choices for the edge e. This gives rise to two possible (non-isomorphic) constructions for the graph G from the graph G'. However in both cases, we have $n = 17$ and $\gamma_t^d(G) \le 7 = (n-3)/2$, a contradiction. Since all the above cases produce a contradiction, the desired result of the claim follows. (□)

We now return to the proof of Claim E. By Claim E.2, $G' \in \{B_1, B_5\}$. If $G' = B_1$, then $G = B_5$. Suppose $G' = B_5$. Then, $n' = 9$ and $n = 13$. Up to isomorphism, there are two different choices for the edge e. If e is on one of the two paths of length 2 that join the two vertices of degree 3 in G', then $\gamma_t^d(G) \le 5 = (n-3)/2$, a contradiction. Hence, e is on the path of length 6 that join the two vertices of degree 3 in G'. In this case, $G = B_{11}$. This completes the proof of Claim E. □

We next consider the case when F is connected and $\delta(F) \ge 2$.

Claim F *If F is connected and $\delta(F) \geq 2$, then $G \in \{B_3, B_4, B_7\}$.*

Proof of Claim F. Assume that F is connected and $\delta(F) \geq 2$. By the edge-minimality of G and since $\gamma_t^d(F) \geq \gamma_t^d(G') \geq (n'-1)/2$, the graph F is a $\frac{1}{2}$-minimal graph. By the inductive hypothesis, $F \in \mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{D} \cup \mathcal{D}_b \cup \mathcal{G}$.

Claim F.1 *Both u and v are special vertices in F.*

Proof of Claim F.1 Suppose to the contrary that u is not a special vertex in F. Then, there is an edge f in F which may be removed without disconnecting F and with no vertex, except possibly for the vertex u, having degree 1 in F. But then $\delta(G-f) \geq 2$ and G is connected, contradicting the edge-minimality of G. Hence, u is a special vertex in F. Analogously, v is a special vertex in F. (□)

Recall from Section 3.2, that for a graph H and vertex x in H, the graph obtained from H by adding a new vertex x' and adding the pendant edge xx' is denoted by H^x.

Claim F.2 *Let $x \in \{u, v\}$. If $\gamma_{nt}^d(F^x) \leq \gamma_t^d(F)$, then there is no $\gamma_{nt}^d(F^x)$-set which DT-dominates x'.*

Proof of Claim F.2 Let $x \in \{u, v\}$ and suppose, to the contrary, that $\gamma_{nt}^d(F^x) \leq \gamma_t^d(F) = \gamma_t^d(G'-e)$ but there exists a $\gamma_{nt}^d(F^x)$-set, S say, which DT-dominates x'. Renaming u and v if necessary, we may assume that $x = v$. Then the set $(S \setminus \{v'\}) \cup \{u, w_4\}$ is a DTD-set of G, and so $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq |S| + 1 = \gamma_t^d(F) + 1$. If $\gamma_t^d(F) \leq n'/2$, then $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq n'/2 + 1 = (n-4)/2 + 2 = (n-2)/2$, a contradiction. Hence, $\gamma_t^d(F) = (n'+1)/2$. By Observation 11, $F \in \{C_3, C_7\}$. Since u and v are not adjacent in F, the case $F = C_3$ cannot occur. Therefore, $F = C_7$ and u and v are at distance either 2 or 3 apart in F. This gives rise to two possible constructions for the graph G from the graph F. However in both cases, we have $n = 11$ and $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq 4 = (n-3)/2$, a contradiction. (□)

Claim F.3 *If $x \in \{u, v\}$, then $\gamma_{nt}^d(F^x) > \gamma_t^d(F)$.*

Proof of Claim F.3 Let $x \in \{u, v\}$ and suppose, to the contrary, that $\gamma_{nt}^d(F^x) \leq \gamma_t^d(F)$. Renaming u and v if necessary, we may assume that $x = v$. By Claim F.2, there is no $\gamma_{nt}^d(F^v)$-set which DT-dominates v'. By Observation 19, either $F = D(4,4)$ and v is at distance 2 from the vertex of degree 4 in F or $F \in \{D_b(3,4), D_b(3,3,1)\}$, $d_F(v) = 3$, and v belongs to a 3-cycle in F.

Suppose that $F = D(4,4)$ and v is at distance 2 from the vertex of degree 4 in F. Since $\mathcal{L}$ is an independent set in G, and since u and v are not adjacent in F, either u is the vertex of degree 4 in F or u is the vertex at distance 2 from v in F.

Suppose that $F = D_b(3,4)$. Then, v is the vertex of degree 3 in F that belongs to a 3-cycle. Since $\mathcal{L}$ is an independent set in G, and since u and v are not adjacent in F, the vertex u is the vertex in F at distance 3 from v in F.

Suppose that $F = D_b(3,3,1)$. Then, v is one of the two vertices of degree 3 in F that belongs to a 3-cycle. Since $\mathcal{L}$ is an independent set in G, and since u and v are not adjacent in F, the vertex u is the other vertex in F of degree 3 in F that belongs to a 3-cycle.

In all the above cases, the graph G is determined. In particular, G has order $n = 11$ and $\gamma_t^d(G) \le 4 \le (n-3)/2$, a contradiction. (□)

By Claim F.3, $\gamma_{nt}^d(F^u) > \gamma_t^d(F)$, and so Observation 18 applies to the graph F and the special vertex u. Analogously, by Claim F.3, $\gamma_{nt}^d(F^v) > \gamma_t^d(F)$, and so Observation 18 applies to the graph F and the special vertex v. Since there is only one identified vertex in a good-graph (that belongs to the family $\mathcal{G}$), we therefore have that either $F \in \{C_4, C_5\}$ or $F = B_1$ and u and v are the two vertices of degree 3 in F. If $F = C_4$, then u and v are at distance 2 apart in F, implying that $G = B_3$. If $F = C_5$, then u and v are at distance 2 apart in F, implying that $G = B_7$. If $F = B_1$, then u and v are the two vertices of degree 3 in F, implying that $G = B_4$. Thus we have shown that $G \in \{B_3, B_4, B_7\}$. This completes the proof of Claim F. □

The proof of Lemma 24 follows immediately from Lemma E and Lemma F. □

By Lemma 24, we may assume that G does not contain a path on six vertices each internal vertex of which has degree 2 in G and whose end vertices are not adjacent, for otherwise the desired result follows.

Lemma 25 *If G contains a vertex of degree 3 adjacent to ends of a 2-handle, then $G = B_9$ or $G \in \mathcal{G}$.*

Proof of Lemma 25. Assume that G contains a vertex of degree 3 adjacent to ends of a 2-handle, C. Let P be the 2-path which has an end adjacent to u, and let v be the other large vertex adjacent with an end of P. Let w be a neighbor of u on C, let z be the neighbor of u on P, and let y be the end of P different from z (possibly, $y = z$). Let C contain $r-1$ vertices and P contain s vertices. By Lemma 24, $3 \le r \le 6$, and $1 \le s \le 3$. Let $G_1 = G[V(C) \cup \{u\} \cup V(P)]$ and let $G_2 = G - V(G_1)$. Then, G_1 is a key $L_{r,s}$. Further, G_2 is a connected graph with $\delta(G_2) \ge 2$ and $v \in V(G_2)$. For $i = 1, 2$, let G_i have order n_i, and so $n = n_1 + n_2$. We note that $4 \le n_1 \le 9$. The following result is straightforward to verify.

Claim G $(n_1 - 2)/2 \le \gamma_t^d(G_1) \le (n_1 + 2)/2$. *More precisely, the following holds.*
- $\gamma_t^d(G_1) = (n_1 + 1)/2$ *if and only if* $G_1 = L_{4,3}$.
- $\gamma_t^d(G_1) = n_1/2$ *if and only if* $G_1 \in \{L_{3,1}, L_{3,3}, L_{4,2}, L_{5,3}\}$.
- $\gamma_t^d(G_1) = (n_1 - 1)/2$ *if and only if* $G_1 \in \{L_{3,2}, L_{4,1}, L_{5,2}, L_{6,1}, L_{6,3}\}$.
- $\gamma_t^d(G_1) = (n_1 - 2)/2$ *if and only if* $G_1 \in \{L_{5,1}, L_{6,2}\}$.

If G_2 is a cycle, then G is a dumb-bell, a contradiction. Hence, G_2 is not a cycle. In particular, $G_2 \notin \mathcal{C}$. Since G is an edge-minimal graph, so too is G_2. By Observation 22, $G_2 \in \mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{D} \cup \mathcal{D}_b \cup \mathcal{G}$ or $\gamma_t^d(G_2) \le (n_2 - 2)/2$.

Claim H *The following holds.*
(a) $(n_1 - 1)/2 \le \gamma_t^d(G_1) \le n_1/2$.
(b) $(n_2 - 1)/2 \le \gamma_t^d(G_2) \le n_2/2$.
(c) $\gamma_t^d(G_1) = n_1/2$ *or* $\gamma_t^d(G_2) = n_2/2$.

Proof of Claim H (a) Since $\gamma_t^d(G) \le \gamma_t^d(G_1)+\gamma_t^d(G_2)$, if $\gamma_t^d(G_1) \le (n_1-2)/2$, then $\gamma_t^d(G) \le (n_1-2)/2+n_2/2 = (n-2)/2$, a contradiction. Hence, $\gamma_t^d(G_1) \ge (n_1-1)/2$. It remains for us to show that $\gamma_t^d(G_1) \le n_1/2$. Suppose to the contrary that $\gamma_t^d(G_1) > n_1/2$. Then, by Claim G, $G_1 = L_{4,3}$ and $\gamma_t^d(G_1) = 3$. Further, G has order $n = n_7+7$. If $\gamma_t^d(G_2) \le (n_2-1)/2$, then $\gamma_t^d(G) \le \gamma_t^d(G_1) + \gamma_t^d(G_2) \le 3 + (n-8)/2 = (n-2)/2$, a contradiction. Therefore, $\gamma_t^d(G_2) \ge n_2/2$. As observed earlier, $\gamma_t^d(G_2) \le n_2/2$. Consequently, $\gamma_t^d(G_2) = n_2/2$. By Observation 11, $G_2 \in \{B_3, D_b(4,4), D_b(3,4,1), D_b(3,3,2)\}$. This implies by Observation 15 that every vertex of G_2 is a good-vertex. Let S be a $\gamma_t^d(G_2)$-set that contains the vertex v. Let w be a neighbor of u on C. Then, $S \cup \{u, w\}$ is a DTD-set of G, and so $\gamma_t^d(G) \le |S| + 2 = \gamma_t^d(G_2) + 2 = n_2/2 + 2 = (n-3)/2$, a contradiction. This establishes Part (a).

(b) If $\gamma_t^d(G_2) \le (n_2-2)/2$, then $\gamma_t^d(G) \le \gamma_t^d(G_1)+\gamma_t^d(G_2) \le n_1/2+(n_2-2)/2 = (n-2)/2$, a contradiction. Hence, $G_2 \in \mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{D} \cup \mathcal{D}_b \cup \mathcal{G}$. Thus, by Observation 11, $\gamma_t^d(G_2) \le n_2/2$.

(c) Part (c) follows from Parts (a) and (b) above and the observation that $(n-1)/2 = (n_1+n_2-1)/2 \le \gamma_t^d(G) \le \gamma_t^d(G_1) + \gamma_t^d(G_2)$. (□)

Claim I *If* $\gamma_t^d(G_1) = n_1/2$, *then* $G = B_9$ *or* $G \in \mathcal{G}$.

Proof of Claim I Suppose that $\gamma_t^d(G_1) = n_1/2$. By Claim G, $G_1 \in \{L_{3,1}, L_{3,3}, L_{4,2}, L_{5,3}\}$.

Claim I.1 $G_1 = L_{3,1}$.

Proof of Claim I.1 Suppose the contrary that $G_1 \in \{L_{3,3}, L_{4,2}, L_{5,3}\}$. By Claim H, $\gamma_t^d(G_2) \le n_2/2$. If $G_1 = L_{5,3}$, then $n_1 = 8$ and every $\gamma_t^d(G_2)$-set can be extended to a DTD-set of G by adding to it the vertices u, v and w, and so $\gamma_t^d(G) \le \gamma_t^d(G_2) + 3 \le n_2/2 + 3 = (n-2)/2$, a contradiction. Hence, $G_1 \in \{L_{3,3}, L_{4,2}\}$ and $n_1 = 6$.

We show firstly that v is a bad-vertex in G_2. Suppose to the contrary that v is a good-vertex in G_2 and let S be a $\gamma_t^d(G_2)$-set that contains v. Then, $S \cup \{u, w\}$ is a DTD-set of G, and so $\gamma_t^d(G) \le |S| + 2 = \gamma_t^d(G_2) + 2 = n_2/2 + 2 \le (n-2)/2$, a contradiction. Hence, v is a bad-vertex in G_2. Therefore, by Observation 15, $G_2 \in \{D(4,4), D_b(3,4), D_b(3,3,1)\} \cup \mathcal{G}_0$. Further, if $G_2 \in \mathcal{G}_0$, then v is the identified vertex of G_2, while if $G_2 \in \{D(4,4), D_b(3,4), D_b(3,3,1)\}$, then v is a vertex at distance 2 from the central vertex of G_2.

Suppose $G_2 \in \{D(4,4), D_b(3,4), D_b(3,3,1)\}$. Then, $n_2 = 7$ and v is a vertex at distance 2 from the central vertex of G_2. In this case, $n = 13$ and in all cases we have $\gamma_t^d(G) \le 5 = (n-2)/2$, irrespective of whether $G_1 = L_{3,3}$ or $G_1 = L_{4,2}$. This produces a contradiction. Therefore, $G_2 \in \mathcal{G}_0$ and v is the identified vertex of G_2. But then by Observation 16, there

is a $\gamma_t^d(G_2)$-set, S, such that all neighbors of v in G_2 belong to the set S. Such a set S can be extended to a DTD-set in G by adding to it at most two vertices of G_1. Hence, $\gamma_t^d(G) \le |S| + 2 \le (n_2 - 1)/2 + 2 = (n-3)/2$, a contradiction. (□)

We now return to the proof of Claim I. By Claim I.1, $G_1 = L_{3,1}$. Thus, $n_1 = 4$ and $n = n_2 + 4$. By Claim H(b) and our earlier observations, $G_2 \in \mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{D} \cup \mathcal{D}_b \cup \mathcal{G}$.

Claim I.2 *The vertex v is a special vertex of G_2 and $\gamma_{nt}^d(G_2^v) > \gamma_t^d(G_2)$.*

Proof of Claim I.2 Suppose to the contrary that v is not a special vertex in G_2. Then, there is an edge f in F which may be removed without disconnecting F and with no vertex, except possibly for the vertex v, having degree 1 in G_2. But then $\delta(G - f) \ge 2$ and G is connected, contradicting the edge-minimality of G. Hence, v is a special vertex of G_2. We show next that $\gamma_{nt}^d(G_2^v) > \gamma_t^d(G_2)$. Suppose to the contrary that $\gamma_{nt}^d(G_2^v) \le \gamma_t^d(G_2)$. Let S be a $\gamma_{nt}^d(G_2^v)$-set. In particular, $v' \in S$. The set $(S \cup \{u, z\}) \setminus \{v'\}$ is a DTD-set in G, and so $\gamma_t^d(G) \le |S| + 1 \le n_2/2 + 1 = (n-2)/2$, a contradiction. (□)

By Claim I.2, the vertex v is a special vertex of G_2 and $\gamma_{nt}^d(G_2^v) > \gamma_t^d(G_2)$. The graph G_2 is therefore one of the graphs listed in (b), (c) or (d) in the statement of Observation 18. We consider the three possibilities in turn.

If $G_2 = B_1$ with v a vertex of degree 3 in G_2, then $G = B_9$. If $G_2 \in \mathcal{G}$ and v is the identified vertex of G_2, then $G_2 = G_k(i,j)$ for some non-negative integers i, j, k, where $k \le 6$, $i + j \ge 2$ if $k = 0$ and $i + j \ge 1$ if $k \ge 1$. In this case, $G = G_k(i+1, j) \in \mathcal{G}$. Finally, if $G_2 \in \mathcal{G}_0$ and v is a neighbor of the identified vertex of G_2, then $G_2 = G_0(i,j)$ for some non-negative integers i, j where $i + j \ge 2$. If v belongs to a type-1 unit in G_2, then $G = G_3(i-1, j) \in \mathcal{G}_3$. If v belongs to a type-2 unit in G_2, then $G = G_4(i, j-1) \in \mathcal{G}_4$. In both cases, $G \in \mathcal{G}$. This completes the proof of Claim I. □

Claim J *If $\gamma_t^d(G_1) = (n_1 - 1)/2$, then $G \in \mathcal{G}_3 \cup \mathcal{G}_4 \cup \mathcal{G}_5$.*

Proof of Claim J Suppose that $\gamma_t^d(G_1) = (n_1 - 1)/2$. By Claim G, we see that $G_1 \in \{L_{3,2}, L_{4,1}, L_{5,2}, L_{6,1}, L_{6,3}\}$. Recall that w is a neighbor of u on C, z is the neighbor of u on P, and y is the end of P different from z (possibly, $y = z$). Let S_1 be a $\gamma_t^d(G_1)$-set chosen so that the neighbor of y on P belongs to S_1 (this is possible due to the structure of G_1).

Since $\gamma_t^d(G_1) = (n_1 - 1)/2$, by Claim H we have $\gamma_t^d(G_2) = n_2/2$. Thus by Observation 11, $G_2 \in \{B_3, D_b(4,4), D_b(3,4,1), D_b(3,3,2)\}$. Since the set $\mathcal{L}$ is independent in G, we note that $G_2 \ne D_b(4,4)$ since the two adjacent vertices of degree 3 in G_2 will also be adjacent in G. Further, the vertex v is a special vertex of G_2.

Suppose that $G_2 = B_3$. Since G is edge-minimal, there are only two choices for the vertex v, namely, v is one of the two large vertex (of degree 3) in G_2 or v is a small vertex (of degree 2) at distance 2 from a large vertex in G_2. In both cases, the set S_1 can be extended to a DTD-set of G by adding to it three vertices from G_2, and so $\gamma_t^d(G) \le \gamma_t^d(G_1) + \gamma_t^d(G_2) - 1 = (n_1 + n_2 - 3)/2 = (n-3)/2$, a contradiction. Hence, $G_2 \ne B_3$.

Claim J.1 *If $G_2 = D_b(3, 4, 1)$, then $G \in \mathcal{G}_4 \cup \mathcal{G}_5$.*

Proof of Claim J.1 Suppose that $G_2 = D_b(3, 4, 1)$. Then, $n = n_1 + 8$. The graph G_2 can be obtained from a path $u_1u_2 \ldots u_8$ by joining the vertices u_1 and u_4, and the vertices u_6 and u_8. Since v is a special vertex of G_2, we note that $v \in \{u_2, u_4, u_5, u_6\}$. If $v = u_2$, let $S = S_1 \cup \{u_4, u_5, u_6\}$, while if $v = u_6$, let $S = S_1 \cup \{u_1, u_4, u_6\}$. In both cases, S is a DTD-set of G, and so $\gamma_t^d(G) \le |S| + 3 = \gamma_t^d(G_1) + \gamma_t^d(G_2) - 1 = (n-3)/2$, a contradiction. Hence, $v = u_4$ or $u = u_5$. If $G_1 \in \{L_{5,2}, L_{6,1}\}$, then $n = 15$ and the set $\{u_1, u_5, u_6\}$ can be extended to a DTD-set of G by adding to it three vertices from G_1, implying that $\gamma_t^d(G) \le 6 = (n-3)/2$, a contradiction. If $G_1 = L_{6,3}$, then $n = 17$ the set $\{u_1, u_5, u_6\}$ can be extended to a DTD-set of G by adding to it four vertices from G_1, implying that $\gamma_t^d(G) \le 7 = (n-3)/2$, a contradiction. Hence, $G_1 = L_{3,2}$ or $G_1 = L_{4,1}$. If $v = u_4$, then $G \in \mathcal{G}_4$. If $v = u_5$, then $G \in \mathcal{G}_5$. (□)

Claim J.2 *If $G_2 = D_b(3, 3, 2)$, then $G \in \mathcal{G}_3$.*

Proof of Claim J.2 Suppose that $G_2 = D_b(3, 3, 2)$. Then, $n = n_1 + 8$. The graph G_2 can be obtained from a path $u_1u_2 \ldots u_8$ by joining the vertices u_1 and u_3, and the vertices u_6 and u_8. Since v is a special vertex of G_2, we note that $v \in \{u_3, u_4, u_5, u_6\}$. Renaming vertices if necessary, we may assume that $v = u_3$ or $v = u_4$. If $v = u_3$, then the set $S_1 \cup \{u_3, u_5, u_6\}$ is a DTD-set of G, implying that $\gamma_t^d(G) \le \gamma_t^d(G_1) + 3 = \gamma_t^d(G_1) + \gamma_t^d(G_2) - 1 = (n-3)/2$, a contradiction. Hence, $v = u_4$. If $G_1 \in \{L_{5,2}, L_{6,1}\}$, then $n = 15$ and the set $\{u_3, u_5, u_6\}$ can be extended to a DTD-set of G by adding to it three vertices from G_1, implying that $\gamma_t^d(G) \le 6 = (n-3)/2$, a contradiction. If $G_1 = L_{6,3}$, then $n = 17$ the set $\{u_3, u_5, u_6\}$ can be extended to a DTD-set of G by adding to it four vertices from G_1, implying that $\gamma_t^d(G) \le 7 = (n-3)/2$, a contradiction. Hence, $G_1 = L_{3,2}$ or $G_1 = L_{4,1}$. In both cases, $G \in \mathcal{G}_3$. (□)

Claim J now follows from Claim J.1 and Claim J.2. □

We now return to the proof of Lemma 25. By Claim H, $\gamma_t^d(G_1) = n_1/2$ or $\gamma_t^d(G_1) = (n_1 - 1)/2$. If $\gamma_t^d(G_1) = n_1/2$, then by Claim I, $G = B_9$ or $G \in \mathcal{G}$. If $\gamma_t^d(G_1) = (n_1 - 1)/2$, then by Claim J, $G \in \mathcal{G}_4 \cup \mathcal{G}_5$. This completes the proof of Lemma 25. □

By Lemma 25, we may assume that if G contains a vertex adjacent to ends of a 2-handle, then such a vertex has degree at least 4 in G, for otherwise the desired result follows. By our earlier observations, every 2-handle in G has order at most 5.

Lemma 26 *Every 2-handle in G has order 2 or 5.*

Proof of Lemma 26. Suppose that G contains a 2-handle C with $|V(C)| \in \{3, 4\}$. Let C be the path $v_1v_2 \ldots v_t$, where $t \in \{3, 4\}$ and let v be the vertex in G adjacent to both ends of C (the vertices v_1 and v_t). By our assumptions to date, $d_G(v) \ge 4$. Let $N_v = N(v) \setminus \{v_1, v_t\}$. By Lemma 23, N_v comprises only small vertices. We note that $|N_v| \ge 2$.

Let $G' = G - V(C)$. The graph G' is a connected subgraph of G with $\delta(G') \geq 2$. Let G' have order $n' = n - t$. The degree of every large vertex different from v is unchanged in G and G', and so G' contains at least one large vertex. Hence, G' is not a cycle and, by Observation 22, $G' \in \mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{D} \cup \mathcal{D}_b \cup \mathcal{G}$ or $\gamma_t^d(G') \leq (n'-2)/2$. We proceed with the following claim.

Claim K *$G' \in \mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{D} \cup \mathcal{D}_b \cup \mathcal{G}$.*

Proof of Claim K. Suppose to the contrary that $\gamma_t^d(G') \leq (n'-2)/2$. Let S be a $\gamma_t^d(G')$-set. If $t = 4$, then $S \cup \{v, v_1\}$ is a DTD-set of G, and so $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq |S| + 2 = \gamma_t^d(G') + 2 = (n'-2)/2 + 2 = (n-2)/2$, a contradiction. Hence, $t = 3$.

Claim K.1 *N_v is an independent set in G.*

Proof of Claim K.1 Suppose there are two adjacent vertices, w_1 and w_2, in N_v. Let $H = G - \{w_1, w_2\}$ and let H have order $n_H = n-2$. Then, H is a connected graph with minimum degree at least 2. By Observation 22, either $\gamma_t^d(H) \leq (n_H - 2)/2$ or $H \in \mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{D}_b \cup \mathcal{D} \cup \mathcal{G}$. We note that $d_H(v) \geq 3$ and that the degree of each large vertex in G other than v is unchanged in H. Since G contains at least two large vertices, the graph H is therefore not a cycle. Hence, by Observation 11, $\gamma_t^d(H) \leq n_H/2$. By considering the cycle $vv_1v_2v_3v$ in H, we can choose a $\gamma_t^d(H)$-set to contain v or to contain at least two vertices in $N_H(v)$. In both cases this set is a DTD-set of G. Hence, $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq \gamma_t^d(H) \leq n_H/2 = (n-2)/2$, a contradiction. (□)

Claim K.2. *The only common neighbor of two vertices in N_v is the vertex v.*

Proof of Claim K.2 Suppose to the contrary that two vertices w_1 and w_2 in N_v have a common neighbor, x, different from v. We show first that $d_G(x) \geq 3$. Suppose to the contrary that $d_G(x) = 2$. In this case we consider the connected graph $H = G - \{w_1, w_2, x\}$. Let H have order $n_H = n - 3$. Since $|\mathcal{L}| \geq 2$ in G, H has at least two large vertices, and so $d_H(v) \geq 3$. Thus, H is not a cycle. Applying the inductive hypothesis and Observation 11 to the graph H, we have that $\gamma_t^d(H) \leq n_H/2$. By considering the cycle $vv_1v_2v_3v$ in H, we can choose a $\gamma_t^d(H)$-set to contain v or to contain at least two vertices in $N_H(v)$. In both cases adding the vertex w_1 to such a set produces a DTD-set of G, and so $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq \gamma_t^d(H) + 1$. If $\gamma_t^d(H) \leq (n_H - 1)/2$, then $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq (n_H - 1)/2 + 1 = (n-2)/2$, a contradiction. Hence, $\gamma_t^d(H) = n_H/2$. Since $vv_1v_2v_3v$ is a cycle in H and $d_H(v) \geq 3$, by Observation 11 we deduce that $H \in \{D_b(4,4), D_b(3,4,1)\}$. If $H = D_b(4,4)$, then $\mathcal{L}$ is not an independent set in G, a contradiction. If $H = D_b(3,4,1)$, then the graph G is determined and $\gamma_t^d(G) = 4 = (n-3)/2$, a contradiction. Hence, $d_G(x) \geq 3$.

We now consider the graph $H = G - w_1$. The degree of each vertex in H different from v and x remains unchanged from its degree in G. Further, $d_H(v) \geq 3$ and $d_H(x) \geq 2$, and so H is a connected graph with $\delta(H) \geq 2$. Since H is a subgraph of G, H is edge-minimal. Let

H have order $n_H = n-1$. By considering the cycle $vv_1v_2v_3v$ in H, we can choose a $\gamma_t^d(H)$-set to contain v or to contain at least two vertices in $N_H(v)$. Such a $\gamma_t^d(H)$-set is a DTD-set of G implying that $\gamma_t^d(G) \le \gamma_t^d(H)$. Applying the inductive hypothesis to the edge-minimal graph H (which we recall is not a cycle), $\gamma_t^d(H) \le n_H/2$. If $\gamma_t^d(H) \le (n_H-1)/2$, then $\gamma_t^d(G) \le (n-2)/2$, a contradiction. Hence, $\gamma_t^d(H) = n_H/2$. Since $vv_1v_2v_3v$ is a cycle in H and $d_H(v) \ge 3$, by Observation 11 we deduce that $H = D_b(3,4,1)$. But then, G is determined and $\gamma_t^d(G) = 3 = (n-3)/2$, a contradiction. (□)

We now return to the proof of Claim K. Let G^* be the graph obtained from $G' - v$ by selecting a vertex $w \in N_v$ (of degree 1 in $G' - v$) and joining it to every other vertex in N_v. Let G^* have order $n^* = n' - 1 = n - 4$. We note that by Claim K.1 and Claim K.2, and by the fact that G' is edge-minimal, the graph G^* is edge-minimal. By construction G^* has $|\mathcal{L}| - 1 \ge 1$ large vertices, implying that G^* is not a cycle. Hence, by the inductive hypothesis $G^* \in \mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{D} \cup \mathcal{D}_b \cup \mathcal{G}$ or $\gamma_t^d(G^*) \le (n^*-2)/2$.

Suppose $\gamma_t^d(G^*) \le (n^*-2)/2$. Let S^* be a $\gamma_t^d(G^*)$-set. If $|S^* \cap N_v| = 1$, let $S = S^* \cup \{v, v_1\}$. If $|S^* \cap N_v| \ge 2$, let $S = S^* \cup \{v_1, w\}$. In both cases, S is a NTD-set of G and $|S| \le |S^*| + 2$, implying that $\gamma_t^d(G) \le \gamma_t^d(G^*) + 2 = (n^*-2)/2 + 2 = (n-2)/2$, a contradiction. Hence, $G^* \in \mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{D} \cup \mathcal{D}_b \cup \mathcal{G}$. Since G^* is not a cycle, Observation 11 implies that $\gamma_t^d(G^*) \le n^*/2$.

Let $x \in N_v \setminus \{w\}$ and consider the edge $e = wx$ that was added to $G' - v$ when constructing G^*. If e is a good-edge in G^*, then every $\gamma_t^d(G^*)$-set containing w and x may be extended to a DTD-set of G by adding to it the vertex v_1, implying that $\gamma_t^d(G) \le \gamma_t^d(G^*) + 1 \le n^*/2 + 1 = (n-2)/2$, a contradiction. Therefore, the edge e is a bad-edge of G^*. By Observation 14, $G^* \in \{D(4,4), D_b(3,4), D_b(3,3,1)\} \cup \mathcal{G} \setminus \mathcal{G}_1$.

Suppose $G^* \in \{D(4,4), D_b(3,4), D_b(3,3,1)\}$. If $G^* = D(4,4)$, then the edge e satisfies Observation 14(a) and the graph G is determined. In this case, $n = 11$ and $\gamma_t^d(G) \le 4 = (n-3)/2$, a contradiction. If $G^* = D_b(3,4)$, then the edge e satisfies Observation 14(b), implying that $\mathcal{L}$ is not an independent set in G, a contradiction. If $G^* = D_b(3,3,1)$, then the edge e satisfies Observation 14(c). In this case, we contradict Claim K.1 or Claim K.2. Since all three cases produce a contradiction, $G^* \in \mathcal{G} \setminus \mathcal{G}_1$.

Let z be the identified vertex of G^*. By Observation 14(d), the edge $e = wx$ is incident with the identified vertex z. Hence either $w = z$ or $x = z$. In both cases, when we reconstruct the original graph G from G^* the component of $G - vz$ that contains the vertex z contains at least one 2-handle whose ends are adjacent to a vertex of degree 3 in G, contradicting our earlier assumption that a vertex of G adjacent to the ends of a 2-handle has degree at least 4 in G. This completes the proof of Claim K. □

We now return to the proof of Lemma 26. By Claim K, $G' \in \mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{D} \cup \mathcal{D}_b \cup \mathcal{G}$. Since G' is not a cycle, Observation 11 implies that $\gamma_t^d(G') \le n'/2$. If v is a good-vertex in G', then every $\gamma_t^d(G')$-set can be extended to DTD-set of G by adding to it the vertex v_1, implying that in this case $\gamma_t^d(G) \le \gamma_t^d(G') + 1 \le n'/2 + 1$.

Claim L $t = 3$.

Proof of Claim L. Suppose to the contrary that $t = 4$. Then, $n' = n - 4$. If v is a good-vertex in G', then $\gamma_t^d(G) \le n'/2 + 1 = (n-2)/2$, a contradiction. Hence, v is a bad-vertex in G, and so, by Observation 15, $G \in \{D(4,4), D_b(3,4), D_b(3,3,1)\} \cup \mathcal{G}_0$. Suppose $G' \in \mathcal{G}_0$. Then, $G' = G_0(n_1, n_2) \in \mathcal{G}_0$, where $n_1 + n_2 \ge 2$. By Observation 15(a), the vertex v is the identified vertex of G. We note that G' contains $n_1 + n_2$ 2-handles whose ends are adjacent to a vertex of degree 3 in G'. Reconstructing the original graph G from G' we therefore note that G contains $n_1 + n_2$ 2-handles whose ends are adjacent to a vertex of degree 3 in G, a contradiction. Hence, $G' \in \{D(4,4), D_b(3,4), D_b(3,3,1)\}$. By Observation 15(b), v is a vertex at distance 2 from the central vertex in G'. If $G' = D_b(3,4)$, then $\mathcal{L}$ is not a independent set in G, a contradiction. Hence, $G' \in \{D(4,4), D_b(3,3,1)\}$. In both cases, the graph G is determined and $\gamma_t^d(G) = 4 = (n-3)/2$, a contradiction. (□)

By Claim L, $t = 3$. Thus, $n' = n - 3$. Suppose $\gamma_t^d(G') = n'/2$. By Observation 11 and by our assumption that $\mathcal{L}$ is an independent set in G, $G' \in \{B_3, D_b(3,4,1), D_b(3,3,2)\}$. Since $v \in \mathcal{L}$ and $\mathcal{L}$ is an independent set in G, the vertex v is not adjacent to a large vertex in G'. If $G' = B_3$, then, up to isomorphism, there are two possible graphs G. In both cases, $\gamma_t^d(G) = 4 = (n-3)/2$, a contradiction. Hence $G' \in \{D_b(3,4,1), D_b(3,3,2)\}$. In both cases, however we reconstruct the original graph G, we produce a 2-handle whose ends are adjacent to a vertex of degree 3 in G, a contradiction. Hence, $\gamma_t^d(G) \le (n'-1)/2$.

If v is a good-vertex in G', then $\gamma_t^d(G) \le (n'-1)/2 + 1 = (n-2)/2$, a contradiction. Hence, v is a bad-vertex in G'. By Observation 15, $G' \in \{D(4,4), D_b(3,4), D_b(3,3,1)\} \cup \mathcal{G}_0$. If $G' \in \mathcal{G}_0$, then analogously as in the proof of Claim L the graph G would contain a 2-handle whose ends are adjacent to a vertex of degree 3 in G, a contradiction. If $G' = D_b(3,4)$, then $\mathcal{L}$ is not a independent set in G, a contradiction. Hence, $G' \in \{D(4,4), D_b(3,3,1)\}$. By Observation 15(b), v is a vertex at distance 2 from the central vertex in G'. In both cases, the graph G is determined and $\gamma_t^d(G) = 4 = (n-2)/2$, a contradiction. This completes the proof of Lemma 26. □

By Lemma 26, every 2-handle in G has order 2 or 5. We show next that in fact G contains no 2-handle.

Lemma 27 *There is no 2-handle in G.*

Proof of Lemma 27. Suppose to the contrary that G contains a 2-handle, C. Then, $|V(C)| \in \{2, 5\}$. Let C be the path $v_1 v_2 \dots v_t$, where $t \in \{2, 5\}$ and let v be the vertex in G adjacent to both ends of C. By our assumptions to date, $d_G(v) \ge 4$ and every neighbor of v has degree 2. Let $F = G - V(C)$ and let F have order $n_F = n - t$. By construction, F is a connected subgraph of G with $\delta(F) \ge 2$. By Observation 22, $F \in \mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{D} \cup \mathcal{D}_b \cup \mathcal{G}$ or $\gamma_t^d(F) \le (n_F - 2)/2$.

Suppose $\gamma_t^d(F) \le (n_F - 2)/2$. If $t = 2$, then $n_F = n - 2$ and every $\gamma_t^d(F)$-set can be extended to a DTD-set of G by adding to it the vertex v, implying that $\gamma_t^d(G) \le \gamma_t^d(F) + 1 \le$

$(n_F-2)/2+1=(n-2)/2$, a contradiction. If $t=5$, then $n_F=n-5$ and every $\gamma_t^d(F)$-set can be extended to a DTD-set of G by adding to it the vertices v and v_1, implying that $\gamma_t^d(G) \le \gamma_t^d(F)+2 \le (n_F-2)/2+2 \le (n-3)/2$, a contradiction. Hence, $F \in \mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{D} \cup \mathcal{D}_b \cup \mathcal{G}$. Since $|\mathcal{L}| \ge 2$, the graph F has at least one large vertex different from v, implying that F is not a cycle. Hence by Observation 11, $\gamma_t^d(F) \le n_F/2$.

We show that v is a bad-vertex in F. Suppose to the contrary that v is a good-vertex in F. If $t=2$, then every $\gamma_t^d(F)$-set which contains v is a DTD-set of G, implying in this case that $\gamma_t^d(G) \le \gamma_t^d(F) \le n_F/2 = (n-2)/2$, a contradiction. If $t=5$, then every $\gamma_t^d(F)$-set which contains v can be extended to a DTD-set of G by adding to it the vertex v_1, implying in this case that $\gamma_t^d(G) \le \gamma_t^d(F)+1 \le n_F/2-1 = (n-3)/2$, a contradiction. Therefore, v is a bad-vertex in F.

By Observation 15, either $F \in \{D(4,4), D_b(3,4), D_b(3,3,1)\}$ and v is the vertex at distance 2 from the central vertex in F, or $F \in \mathcal{G}_0$ and v is the identified vertex of F. In all cases, the graph G is determined. If $F \in \{D_b(3,4), D_b(3,3,1)\}$, then the set $\mathcal{L}$ is not independent, a contradiction. If $F \in \mathcal{G}_0$, then G contains a vertex of degree 3 adjacent to both ends of a 2-handle, a contradiction. If $F = D(4,4)$, then either $t=2$, in which case $\gamma_t^d(G) = 3 = (n-3)/2$, or $t=5$, in which case $\gamma_t^d(G) \le 5 = (n-2)/2$. Both cases produce a contradiction. This completes the proof of Lemma 27. □

By Lemma 27, there is no 2-handle in G. Recall that by our earlier assumptions, $n \ge 8$ and the set $\mathcal{L}$ is an independent set. Further, G does not contain a path on six vertices each internal vertex of which has degree 2 in G and whose end vertices are not adjacent. In particular, every 2-path in G has order at most 3.

Lemma 28 *If G contains a 4-cycle, then $G = B_8$.*

Proof of Lemma 28. Suppose that G contains a 4-cycle $uvwxu$. Renaming vertices if necessary, we may assume that u and w are large vertices of G (and so v and x are small vertices). We now consider the connected subgraph $G' = G-v$ of G that satisfies $\delta(G') \ge 2$. Let G' have order n', and so $n' = n-1 \ge 7$. By Observation 22, $G' \in \mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{D} \cup \mathcal{D}_b \cup \mathcal{G}$ or $\gamma_t^d(G') \le (n'-2)/2$. Every DTD-set in G' is also a DTD-set in G, implying that $\gamma_t^d(G) \le \gamma_t^d(G')$. If $\gamma_t^d(G') \le (n'-1)/2$, then $\gamma_t^d(G) \le (n-2)/2$, a contradiction. Hence, $\gamma_t^d(G') \ge n'/2$. If G' is a cycle, then G would contain a 2-path of order at least 4, a contradiction. Hence by Observation 11, $G' \in \{B_3, D_b(4,4), D_b(3,4,1), D_b(3,3,2)\}$. If $G' \in \{D_b(4,4), D_b(3,4,1), D_b(3,3,2)\}$, then G contains a 2-handle, a contradiction. Hence, $G' = B_3$, implying that $G = B_8$. □

By Lemma 28, we may assume that G contains no 4-cycle, for otherwise the desired result follows.

Lemma 29 *There is no 5-cycle in G.*

Proof of Lemma 29. Suppose to the contrary that G contains a 5-cycle $uvwxyu$. Renaming vertices if necessary, we may assume that u and w are large vertices of G (and so

v, x and y are small vertices). We now consider the connected subgraph $G' = G - v$ of G that satisfies $\delta(G') \geq 2$. Let G' have order n', and so $n' = n - 1 \geq 7$. By Observation 22, $G' \in \mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{D} \cup \mathcal{D}_b \cup \mathcal{G}$ or $\gamma_t^d(G') \leq (n'-2)/2$. Every DTD-set in G' is also a DTD-set in G, implying that $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq \gamma_t^d(G')$. If $\gamma_t^d(G') \leq (n'-1)/2$, then $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq (n-2)/2$, a contradiction. Hence, $\gamma_t^d(G') \geq n'/2$. By Observation 11 and since every 2-path in G has order at most 3, $G' \in \{C_7, B_3, D_b(4,4), D_b(3,4,1), D_b(3,3,2)\}$. We note that $uyxw$ is an induced path in G' where x and y have degree 2 in G'. This implies that $G' \notin \{D_b(4,4), D_b(3,4,1)\}$. If $G' = C_7$, then $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq |\{u,v,w\}| = (n-2)/2$, a contradiction. If $G' = D_b(3,3,2)$, then u and w are necessarily the two large vertices in G'. But then G contains a 2-handle, a contradiction. If $G' = B_3$, then G contains a 4-cycle, a contradiction. □

By Lemma 29 and our assumptions to date, we may assume that a shortest cycle in G has length at least 6; that is, G has girth at least 6. Recall that every 2-path in G has order at most 3.

Lemma 30 *If G has a 2-path of order 3, then $G = B_6$.*

Proof of Lemma 30. Let $P\colon v_1v_2v_3$ be a 2-path in G and let u and v be the large vertices adjacent to v_1 and v_3, respectively.

Claim M *If u and v do not have a common neighbor, then $G = B_6$.*

Proof of Claim M. Suppose that u and v do not have a common neighbor. We show that $G = B_6$. Let N_u^1 and N_u^2 be the set of vertices at distance 1 and 2, respectively, from u in $G - V(P)$. Let N_v^1 and N_v^2 be defined analogously. By assumption, $N_u^1 \cap N_v^1 = \emptyset$. Every neighbor of a large vertex is a small vertex. In particular, every vertex in $N_u \cup N_v$ has degree 2. Let G' be the graph of order $n' = n - 4$ obtained from $G - (V(P) \cup \{u\})$ by joining the vertices in N_u^1 to the vertex v. Since G is an edge-minimal graph, so too is the graph G'. Since $|N_u^1| \geq 2$ and $|N_v^1| \geq 2$, we note that $d_{G'}(v) = |N_u^1| + |N_v^1| \geq 4$. Hence, G' is not a cycle and G' contains a vertex of degree at least 4. Therefore by the induction hypothesis, either $G' \in \{B_4, B_8, B_9, B_{10}\} \cup \mathcal{D} \cup \mathcal{G}$ or $\gamma_t^d(G') \leq (n'-2)/2$.

Claim M.1 $\gamma_t^d(G') \geq (n'-1)/2$.

Proof of Claim M.1 Suppose to the contrary that $\gamma_t^d(G') \leq (n'-2)/2$. Let S' be a $\gamma_t^d(G')$-set. By construction, $N_{G'}(v) = N_u^1 \cup N_v^1$. Suppose that S' totally dominates the vertex v. Thus, S' contains at least one vertex in $N_u^1 \cup N_v^1$. If S' contains a vertex in N_u^1 and a vertex in N_v^1, let $S = S' \cup \{u,v\}$. If S' contains a vertex of N_v^1 and no vertex of N_u^1, let $S = S' \cup \{u, v_1\}$. If S' contains no vertex of N_v^1 and $v \in S'$, let $S = S' \cup \{u, v_3\}$. If S' contains no vertex of N_v^1 and $v \notin S'$, let $S = S' \cup \{v, v_3\}$. In all four cases, the set S is a DTD-set of G and $|S| = |S'| + 2$, implying that $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq |S| = |S'| + 2 = (n'-2)/2 + 2 = (n-2)/2$, a contradiction. Hence, S' does not totally dominates the vertex v.

Since S' contains no vertex in $N_u^1 \cup N_v^1$, the set S' disjunctively dominates v and therefore contains at least two vertices in $N_u^2 \cup N_v^2$. If $v \in S'$ and S' contains no vertex in N_u^2, let $S = S' \cup \{u, v_1\}$. If $v \in S'$ and S' contains exactly one vertex in N_u^2, let $S = S' \cup \{u, v_2\}$. If $v \in S'$ and S' contains at least two vertices in N_u^2, let $S = S' \cup \{u, v_3\}$. If $v \notin S'$ and S' contains no vertex in N_u^2, let $S = S' \cup \{v_1, v_2\}$. If $v \notin S'$ and S' contains exactly one vertex in N_u^2, let $S = S' \cup \{u, v_2\}$. If $v \notin S'$ and S' contains at least two vertices in N_u^2, let $S = S' \cup \{v_2, v_3\}$. In all six cases, the set S is a DTD-set of G and $|S| = |S'| + 2$, implying that $\gamma_t^d(G) \le |S| = |S'| + 2 = (n' - 2)/2 + 2 = (n - 2)/2$, a contradiction. (□)

By Claim M, $G' \in \{B_4, B_8, B_9, B_{10}\} \cup \mathcal{D} \cup \mathcal{G}$. Since $\mathcal{L}$ is an independent set in G, by construction the set of large vertices in G', namely the set $\mathcal{L} \setminus \{u\}$, form an independent set in G'. If $G' \in \mathcal{G}$, then since v has degree at least 4 in G' and since the large vertices in G' are independent, $G' \in \mathcal{G}_0 \cup \mathcal{G}_1$ (and G' consists only of type-1 units). But then the graph G would contain a 2-handle, a contradiction. Hence, $G' \notin \mathcal{G}$.

If $G' = B_4$, then v is one of the two vertices of degree 4 in G', implying that the graph G contains a 2-path on at least four vertices as well as a 4-cycle, a contradiction. If $G' \in \{B_8, B_9, B_{10}\}$, then v is the vertex of degree 4 in G'. If $G' \in \{B_9, B_{10}\}$, then G would contain a 2-handle, a contradiction. If $G' = B_8$, then since G contains no 4-cycles, there is only one way to reconstruct the graph G from G'. In this case, $n = 13$ and the four large vertices in G form a DTD-set of G, implying that $\gamma_t^d(G) \le 4 = (n - 5)/2$, a contradiction. Hence, $G' \notin \{B_4, B_8, B_9, B_{10}\}$. Therefore, $G \in \mathcal{D}$. But then $\mathcal{L} = \{u, v\}$ and $\{u, v_1, v_3, v\}$ is a DTD-set of G, implying that $\gamma_t^d(G) \le 4$. If $n \ge 10$, then $\gamma_t^d(G) \le (n-2)/2$, a contradiction. Hence, $n = 9$, implying that $G' = D(3, 3)$ and $G = B_6$. This completes the proof of Claim M.1(□)

By Claim M.1, we may assume that u and v have a common neighbor, w say, for otherwise $G = B_6$, and the desired result follows. Since G has no 4-cycle, the vertex w is the only common neighbor of u and v. Let G' be the graph obtained from $G - (V(P) \cup \{w\})$ by adding the edge $e = uv$. Then, G' is a connected graph with $\delta(G') \ge 2$. Let G' have order n', and so $n' = n - 4$.

Claim M.2 *The graph $G' - e$ is an edge-minimal graph.*

Proof of Claim M.2 Suppose to the contrary that $G' - e = G - (V(P) \cup \{w\})$ is not an edge-minimal graph. Then $G' - e$ is disconnected or at least one of u or v has degree 1 in $G' - e$. This implies that the graph G' is an edge-minimal graph. Then, $\gamma_t^d(G') \le (n' - 2)/2$ or $G' \in \mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{D} \cup \mathcal{D}_b \cup \mathcal{G}$. Let S' be a $\gamma_t^d(G')$-set. Suppose $\gamma_t^d(G') \le (n' - 2)/2$. If u or v belong to S', let $S = S' \cup \{u, v, w\}$. Suppose that neither u nor v belong to S'. If both u and v have a neighbor in S', let $S = S' \cup \{u, v\}$. If u has a neighbor in S', let $S = S' \cup \{v_1, w\}$. If v has a neighbor in S', let $S = S' \cup \{v_3, w\}$. If neither u nor v have a neighbor in S', let $S = S' \cup \{u, v\}$. In all the above cases, the set S is a DTD-set of G and $|S| \le |S'| - 2$, implying that $\gamma_t^d(G) \le |S| \le (n' - 2)/2 = (n - 2)/2$, a contradiction. Hence, $G' \in \mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{D} \cup \mathcal{D}_b \cup \mathcal{G}$.

If G' is a cycle, then since G has girth at least 6 and every 2-path in G has order at most 3, we deduce that $G' = C_5$. But then the graph G is determined. In this case, $n = 9$ and $\{u, v, w\}$ is a DTD-set of G, and so $\gamma_t^d(G) = 3 = (n-3)/2$, a contradiction. Hence, G' is not a cycle, implying that $\gamma_t^d(G') \le n'/2$. If e is a good-edge of G', then choosing S' to be a $\gamma_t^d(G')$-set that contains both u and v, the set $S' \cup \{w\}$ is a DTD-set of G, implying that $\gamma_t^d(G) \le |S'| + 1 \le n'/2 + 1 = (n-2)/2$, a contradiction. Hence, e is a bad-edge of G'. However applying Observation 14 to the graph G' and the bad-edge e of G', the graph G necessarily contains a 3-cycle or a 4-cycle, a contradiction. (□)

By Claim M.2, the graph $G' - e = G - (V(P) \cup \{w\})$ is an edge-minimal graph. Thus, $\gamma_t^d(G' - e) \le (n'-2)/2$ or $G' - e \in \mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{D} \cup \mathcal{D}_b \cup \mathcal{G}$. Let S' be a $\gamma_t^d(G' - e)$-set. If $\gamma_t^d(G' - e) \le (n'-2)/2$, then $S' \cup \{u, v\}$ is a DTD-set of G, implying that $\gamma_t^d(G) \le |S| \le (n'-2)/2 = (n-2)/2$, a contradiction. Hence, $G' - e \in \mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{D} \cup \mathcal{D}_b \cup \mathcal{G}$. Since both u and v have degree at least 2 in $G' - e$, we note that $G' \notin \mathcal{D}$. If $G' - e \in \mathcal{D}_b \cup \mathcal{G}$, then G would contain a 3-cycle or a 4-cycle, a contradiction. If $G' - e$ is a cycle, then since G has girth at least 6 and every 2-path in G has order at most 3, we note that $G' \in \{C_6, C_7\}$ and u and v are at distance 3 apart on the cycle. But then the graph G is determined. In this case, $n \in \{10, 11\}$ and $\{u, v, w\}$ is a DTD-set of G, and so $\gamma_t^d(G) = 3 \le (n-4)/2$, a contradiction. If $G' - e \in \mathcal{B}$, then since G has girth at least 6, $G' - e = B_6$ and u and v are the two vertices of degree 3 in $G' - e$. But then $n = 13$ and $\{u, v, w\}$ is a DTD-set of G, and so $\gamma_t^d(G) = 3 = (n-7)/2$, a contradiction. This completes the proof of Lemma 30. □

By Lemma 30, if G has a 2-path of order 3, then $G = B_6$. Hence we may assume that every 2-path in G has order 1 or 2. Thus every small vertex (of degree 2) has either two large neighbors or one large neighbor and one small neighbor depending on whether it belongs to a 2-path of order 1 or a 2-path of order 2, respectively.

Let $\mathcal{S} = (\mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{S}_2)$ be a weak partition of $\mathcal{S}$ (a partition where some of the sets may be empty), where $\mathcal{S}_1$ is the set of small vertices with two large neighbors and $\mathcal{S}_2$ is the set of small vertices with exactly one large neighbor. We note that $G[\mathcal{S}_2]$ consists of the disjoint union of paths of order 2.

Let $\mathcal{L} = (\mathcal{L}_0, \mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2)$ be a weak partition of the large vertices $\mathcal{L}$, where $\mathcal{L}_0$, $\mathcal{L}_1$ and $\mathcal{L}_2$ are the set of large vertices adjacent to zero, one and at least two vertices in $\mathcal{S}_1$, respectively, respectively. Let $\mathcal{S}_{1,1}$ be the set of vertices in $\mathcal{S}_1$ with both neighbors in $\mathcal{L}_1$ and let $\mathcal{S}_{1,2}$ be the set of vertices in $\mathcal{S}_1$ with exactly one neighbor in $\mathcal{L}_1$ (and the other neighbor in $\mathcal{L}_2$). Further, for $i \in \{1, 2\}$ let $\mathcal{L}_{1,i}$ be the set of vertices in $\mathcal{L}_1$ adjacent to a vertex in $\mathcal{S}_{1,i}$. Thus, $(\mathcal{L}_{1,1}, \mathcal{L}_{1,2})$ is a partition of $\mathcal{L}_1$.

Let $|\mathcal{S}| = s$, $|\mathcal{S}_1| = s_1$ and $|\mathcal{S}_2| = 2s_2$, and so $s = s_1 + 2s_2$. Let $|\mathcal{S}_{1,1}| = s_{1,1}$ and $|\mathcal{S}_{1,2}| = s_{1,2}$, and so $s_1 \ge s_{1,1} + s_{1,2}$. Let $|\mathcal{L}| = \ell$, $|\mathcal{L}_0| = \ell_0$, $|\mathcal{L}_1| = \ell_1$, and $|\mathcal{L}_2| = \ell_2$, and so $\ell = \ell_0 + \ell_1 + \ell_2$. Let $|\mathcal{L}_{1,1}| = \ell_{1,1}$ and $|\mathcal{L}_{1,2}| = \ell_{1,2}$, and so $\ell_1 = \ell_{1,1} + \ell_{1,2}$ and

$$\ell = \ell_0 + \ell_{1,1} + \ell_{1,2} + \ell_2. \tag{1}$$

The subgraph $G[\mathcal{L}_{1,1} \cup \mathcal{S}_{1,1}]$ induced by $\mathcal{L}_{1,1} \cup \mathcal{S}_{1,1}$ consists of a disjoint union of paths P_3 on three vertices (where the internal vertices of these paths form the set $\mathcal{S}_{1,1}$), while

$G[\mathcal{L}_{1,2} \cup \mathcal{S}_{1,2}]$ consists of a disjoint union of paths P_2 on two vertices (where each path contains one vertex of $\mathcal{L}_{1,2}$ and one vertex of $\mathcal{S}_{1,2}$.) Therefore,

$$\ell_{1,1} = 2s_{1,1} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \ell_{1,2} = s_{1,2},$$

implying that

$$s_1 \geq \frac{1}{2}\ell_{1,1} + \ell_{1,2}. \tag{2}$$

Counting the edge joining the large vertices to the ends of 2-paths of order 2, this sum is exactly $2s_2$ and at least $3\ell_0 + 2\ell_1 + \ell_2$. Thus,

$$2s_2 \geq 3\ell_0 + 2\ell_{1,1} + 2\ell_{1,2} + \ell_2. \tag{3}$$

By (1), (2) and (3) we therefore have that

$$\begin{aligned} n &= \ell + s_1 + 2s_2 \\ &\geq 4\ell_0 + \tfrac{7}{2}\ell_{1,1} + 4\ell_{1,2} + 2\ell_2 \\ &\geq 4\ell_0 + 3\ell_{1,1} + 4\ell_{1,2} + 2\ell_2 \\ &= 2\ell + 2\ell_0 + \ell_{1,1} + 2\ell_{1,2}, \end{aligned}$$

or, equivalently,

$$\frac{n}{2} \geq \ell + \ell_0 + \frac{1}{2}\ell_{1,1} + \ell_{1,2}. \tag{4}$$

For each vertex $v \in \mathcal{L}_0$, let v' be an arbitrary neighbor of v. Let $D' = \bigcup\{v'\}$, where the union is taken over all vertices $v \in \mathcal{L}_0$. Then, $|D'| = \ell_0$. We now consider the set

$$D = \mathcal{L} \cup D' \cup \mathcal{S}_{1,1} \cup \mathcal{S}_{1,2}.$$

Every vertex in G is totally dominated by the set D, except possibly for vertices in $\mathcal{L}_2$ which are disjunctively dominated by D (since each vertex in $\mathcal{L}_2$ is at distance 2 from at least two vertices in $\mathcal{L}$). The set D is therefore a DTD-set of G, implying by (4) that

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_t^d(G) &\leq |D| \\ &= \ell + \ell_0 + s_{1,1} + s_{1,2} \\ &= \ell + \ell_0 + \tfrac{1}{2}\ell_{1,1} + \ell_{1,2} \\ &\leq \tfrac{n}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 31 *Every 2-path has order 2; that is, $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_0$.*

Proof of Lemma 31. If $\mathcal{L}_{1,2} \neq \emptyset$, then removing from D an arbitrary vertex that belongs to the set $\mathcal{L}_{1,2}$ produces a DTD-set of cardinality $|D| - 1$, implying that $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq (n-2)/2$, a contradiction. Hence, $\mathcal{L}_{1,2} = \emptyset$. This in turn implies that $\mathcal{S}_{1,2} = \emptyset$. Thus, $\ell_{1,2} = s_{1,2} = 0$ and Inequality (2) simplifies to $s_1 \geq \frac{1}{2}\ell_{1,1}$.

If $\mathcal{L}_2 \neq \emptyset$, then there are at least two vertices in $\mathcal{S}_1$ that do not belong to $\mathcal{S}_{1,1}$, and so $s_1 \geq 2 + \frac{1}{2}\ell_{1,1}$. But then Inequality (4) can be strengthened to $\frac{n}{2} \geq \ell + \ell_0 + \frac{1}{2}\ell_{1,1} + 1$, implying that $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq |D| \leq n/2 - 1$, a contradiction. Hence, $\mathcal{L}_2 = \emptyset$. Thus, $\ell_2 = 0$ and $s_1 = \frac{1}{2}\ell_{1,1}$.

Suppose that $\mathcal{L}_1 \neq \emptyset$. Then, by our earlier observations, $\mathcal{L}_1 = \mathcal{L}_{1,1}$. As observed earlier, $\ell_{1,1}$ is even and the subgraph $G[\mathcal{L}_{1,1} \cup \mathcal{S}_{1,1}]$ induced by $\mathcal{L}_{1,1} \cup \mathcal{S}_{1,1}$ consists of a disjoint union of paths P_3 with the internal vertices of these paths forming the set $\mathcal{S}_{1,1}$. Removing from D an arbitrary vertex that belongs to the set $\mathcal{L}_{1,1}$ produces a DTD-set of cardinality $|D| - 1$, implying that $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq (n-2)/2$, a contradiction. Hence, $\mathcal{L}_1 = \emptyset$, implying that $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_0$. This completes the proof of Lemma 31. □

By Lemma 31, every 2-path in G has order 2, implying that $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_0$ and $D = \mathcal{L}_0 \cup D'$.

Lemma 32 *There is no* 6*-cycle in* G*.*

Proof of Lemma 32. Suppose to the contrary that G contains a 6-cycle $C\colon v_1v_2v_3v_4v_5v_6v_1$. Renaming vertices if necessary, we may assume that v_1 and v_4 are large vertices. Recall that for each vertex $v \in \mathcal{L}_0$, we let v' be an arbitrary neighbor of v and the set $D' = \bigcup\{v'\}$, where the union is taken over all vertices $v \in \mathcal{L}_0$. We now remove from D the vertex v_1 and the two vertices v_1' and v_4' (that belong to D') and we replace them with the two neighbors of v_1 on C (namely, the vertices v_2 and v_6). The resulting set is a DTD-set of cardinality $|D| - 1$, implying that $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq (n-2)/2$, a contradiction. (□)

By Lemma 32, G contains no 6-cycle, implying that the girth of G is at least 7. This in turn implies that $|\mathcal{L}| \geq 4$. We now choose an arbitrary vertex $v \in \mathcal{L}$. Let $v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_q$ be the vertices in $\mathcal{L}$ at distance 3 from v. Since G contains no 6-cycle, we note that $q = d_G(v)$. For $i = 1, 2, \ldots, q$, let $v_ia_ib_iv$ be a path in G (and so, a_ib_i is a 2-path in G of order 2 whose one end a_i is adjacent to v_i and whose other end b_i is adjacent to v). If we now choose the vertex v_i' to be the vertex a_i for each $i = 1, 2, \ldots, q$, then the vertex v can be removed from D to produce a DTD-set of cardinality $|D| - 1$, implying that $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq (n-2)/2$, a contradiction. This completes the proof of Theorem 20. □

4.2 Proof of Theorem 5

Let G be a connected graph of order $n \geq 8$ with $\delta(G) \geq 2$. Since $\gamma_t^d(G)$ cannot increase if edges are added, it follows from Theorem 20 and Observation 11 that $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq n/2$. Further, suppose $\gamma_t^d(G) = n/2$. We produce a $\frac{1}{2}$-minimal graph G' from G by removing edges if necessary so that G' satisfies $\gamma_t^d(G') = n/2$. By Theorem 20 and Observation 11, $G' \in \{B_3, D_b(4,4), D_b(3,4,1), D_b(3,3,2), C_8, C_{12}\}$. In all cases it can be readily checked that $G = G'$ or $G' \in \mathcal{F}$ where $\mathcal{F}$ is the family of graphs shown in Fig. 9.

4.3 Proof of Theorem 6

Let G be a connected graph of order $n \geq 18$ with $\delta(G) \geq 2$. Since $\gamma_t^d(G)$ cannot increase if edges are added, it follows from Theorem 20 and Observation 11 that $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq (n-1)/2$. Further, suppose $n \geq 18$ and $\gamma_t^d(G) = (n-1)/2$. We produce a $\frac{1}{2}$-minimal graph G' from G by removing edges if necessary so that G' satisfies $\gamma_t^d(G') = (n-1)/2$. Since $n \geq 18$, $G' \in \mathcal{G}$ by Observation 11. It can readily be checked that $G = G'$ or $G \in \mathcal{H}$ where $\mathcal{H}$ is the family of graphs constructed in Section 1.2.

References

[1] D. Archdeacon, J. Ellis-Monaghan, D. Fischer, D. Froncek, P. C. B. Lam, S. Seager, B. Wei, and R. Yuster, Some remarks on domination. *J. Graph Theory* **46** (2004), 207–210.

[2] R. C. Brigham, J. R. Carrington, and R. P. Vitray, Connected graphs with maximum total domination number. *J. Combin. Math. Combin. Comput.* **34** (2000), 81–96.

[3] F. Chung, Graph Theory in the information age. *Notices of the American Math. Society* **57**(6) (2010), 726–732.

[4] V. Chvátal and C. McDiarmid, Small transversals in hypergraphs. *Combinatorica* **12** (1992), 19–26.

[5] E. J. Cockayne, R. M. Dawes, and S. T. Hedetniemi, Total domination in graphs. *Networks* **10** (1980), 211–219.

[6] W. Goddard, M. A. Henning and C. A. Pilman, The disjunctive domination number of a graph. To appear in *Quaestiones Mathematicae.*

[7] T. W. Haynes, S. T. Hedetniemi, and P. J. Slater, *Fundamentals of Domination in Graphs*, Marcel Dekker, Inc. New York, 1998.

[8] T. W. Haynes, S. T. Hedetniemi, and P. J. Slater (eds), *Domination in Graphs: Advanced Topics*, Marcel Dekker, Inc. New York, 1998.

[9] M. A. Henning, Recent results on total domination in graphs: A survey. *Discrete Math.* **309** (2009), 32–63.

[10] M. A. Henning, Graphs with large total domination number. *J. Graph Theory* **35** (2000), 21–45.

[11] M. A. Henning and V. Naicker, The disjunctive total domination number of a graph. To appear in *J. Comb. Optim.*

[12] M. A. Henning and A. Yeo, *Total domination in graphs (Springer Monographs in Mathematics)* 2013. ISBN: 978-1-4614-6524-9 (Print) 978-1-4614-6525-6 (Online).

[13] J. Platt, A Resource-allocating network for function interpolation. *Neural Computation* **3**(2) (1991), 213–225.

[14] Zs. Tuza, Covering all cliques of a graph. *Discrete Math.* **86** (1990), 117–126.

APPENDIX

This appendix contains proofs of some of selected preliminary results from Section 3. We introduce the following notation for the distance between sets. Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph. For vertex sets $X, Y \subseteq V$, the distance between the sets X and Y, denoted $d_G(X, Y)$ or simply by $d(X, Y)$ if G is clear from context, is the minimum distance $d(x, y)$ taken over all possible pairs of vertices $x \in X$, and $y \in Y$. We begin by establishing the value of $\gamma_t^d(G)$ when G is a path.

Proposition 33 *If $G = P_n$ and $n \geq 2$ then, $\gamma_t^d(G) = \lceil 2(n+1)/5 \rceil + 1$ if $n \equiv 1 (\mathrm{mod}\, 5)$, and $\gamma_t^d(G) = \lceil 2(n+1)/5 \rceil$ otherwise.*

Proof of Proposition 33. We proceed by induction on $n \geq 2$. The result is easily verified for $n \leq 9$. Suppose that $n \geq 10$ and the result is true for all paths of order less than n. Let $G = P_n$ be a path given by $v_1 v_2 \ldots v_n$. We first establish upper bounds on $\gamma_t^d(G)$. Let

$$S = \bigcup_{i=0}^{\lfloor n/5 \rfloor - 1} \{v_{5i+2}, v_{5i+3}\}.$$

If $n \equiv 0 \,(\mathrm{mod}\, 5)$, let $D = S \cup \{v_{n-1}\}$. If $n \equiv i \,(\mathrm{mod}\, 5)$, where $i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$, let $D = S \cup \{v_{n-2}, v_{n-1}\}$. In all cases, the set D is a DTD-set of G. Further if $n \equiv 1 \,(\mathrm{mod}\, 5)$, then $|D| = \lceil 2(n+1)/5 \rceil + 1$, while if $n \not\equiv 1 \,(\mathrm{mod}\, 5)$, then $|D| = \lceil 2(n+1)/5 \rceil$. Hence, $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq \lceil 2(n+1)/5 \rceil + 1$ if $n \equiv 1 \,(\mathrm{mod}\, 5)$ and $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq \lceil 2(n+1)/5 \rceil$ if $n \not\equiv 1 \,(\mathrm{mod}\, 5)$.

To prove the reverse inequality, let T be a $\gamma_t^d(G)$-set. Since v_1 is a leaf vertex in G, we may suppose $v_2 \in T$. Further, since T cannot disjunctively dominate v_2 and $n \geq 10$ we may suppose $v_3 \in T$. Hence, $\{v_2, v_3\} \subset T$. We show next that we can choose T so that $T \cap \{v_4, v_5, v_6\} = \emptyset$.

Suppose that $v_4 \in T$. If $v_5 \in T$, let i be the largest integer such that $i \geq 5$ and $v_i \in T$, and replace v_4 in T with the vertex v_{i+1}. Suppose that $v_5 \notin T$. If $v_6 \in T$, replace v_4 in T with v_5. If $v_6 \notin T$ and $v_7 \in T$, replace v_4 in T with v_6. If $v_6 \notin T$ and $v_7 \notin T$, then $v_8 \in T$ and replace v_4 in T with v_7. In all the above cases, we can choose T so that $v_4 \notin T$.

Suppose that $v_5 \in T$. If $v_6 \notin T$, then $v_7 \in T$ and we can replace v_5 in T with the vertex v_6. If $v_6 \in T$, let i be the largest integer such that $i \geq 6$ and $v_i \in T$, and replace v_5 in T with the vertex v_{i+1}. In both cases we can choose T so that $v_5 \notin T$.

Suppose that $v_6 \in T$. Then, $v_7 \in T$. Let i be the largest integer such that $i \geq 7$ and $v_i \in T$, and replace v_6 in T with the vertex v_{i+1}. Hence we can choose T so that $v_6 \notin T$. Therefore, $T \cap \{v_4, v_5, v_6\} = \emptyset$, implying that $\{v_7, v_8\} \subset T$. Let $T' = T \setminus \{v_1, v_2\}$, and note that $|T'| = |T| - 2$.

We now let G' be obtained from G by deleting the vertices v_i, $1 \leq i \leq 5$. Then, $G' = C_{n'}$, where $n' = n - 5 \geq 5$. Since T is a DTD-set of G, the set T' is a DTD-set of G'. Hence, $\gamma_t^d(G') \leq |T'| = |T| - 2$. Applying the inductive hypothesis to G', we have that

$\gamma_t^d(G') = \lceil 2(n'+1)/5 \rceil + 1 = \lceil 2(n+1)/5 \rceil - 1$ if $n \equiv 1 \pmod 5$ and $\gamma_t^d(G') = \lceil 2(n'+1)/5 \rceil = \lceil 2(n+1)/5 \rceil - 2$ if $n \not\equiv 1 \pmod 5$. This implies that $\gamma_t^d(G) = |T| \geq \lceil 2(n+1)/5 \rceil + 1$ if $n \equiv 1 \pmod 5$ and $\gamma_t^d(G) = |T| \geq \lceil 2(n+1)/5 \rceil$ if $n \not\equiv 1 \pmod 5$. The desired bounds now follow as a consequence of the upper bounds on $\gamma_t^d(G)$ established earlier. □

In order to establish upper bounds on the value of $\gamma_t^d(G)$ for a daisy we require the following proposition.

Proposition 34 *Let G be a daisy with k petals. If v is the vertex of degree $2k$ in G and no $\gamma_t^d(G)$-set contains v, then v is totally dominated in G.*

Proof of Proposition 34. Let G be a daisy of order n with k petals. Let v be the vertex of degree $2k$ in G and suppose that v is not contained in any $\gamma_t^d(G)$-set. We proceed by induction on the number of petals $k \geq 2$. We establish the base case with the following claim.

Claim N $k \geq 3$.

Proof of Claim N. Suppose $k = 2$. Then, $G = D(n_1 + 1, n_2 + 1)$ is a daisy with two petals and v is the vertex of degree 4 in G. Let F_1 and F_2 denote the two cycles passing through v, where $F_i \cong C_{n_i+1}$ for $i = 1, 2$. Let $F_1 = vu_1 \dots u_{n_1}v$ and let $F_2 = vv_1 \dots v_{n_2}v$. We note that $n = n_1 + n_2 + 1 \geq 5$. Assume v is not contained in any $\gamma_t^d(G)$-set and that no $\gamma_t^d(G)$-set totally dominates v in G.

Let S be a $\gamma_t^d(G)$-set. Then, $v \notin S$ and S disjunctively dominates v in G. Since $v \notin S$ $|S \cap V(F_i)| \leq \gamma_t^d(F_i) - 1$ for $i = 1, 2$, otherwise restricting S to one of the cycles F_i gives a DTD-set in that cycle whereby (rearranging vertices) we may choose $v \in S$, a contradiction. Further, $N[v] \cap S = \emptyset$ implying that $n_1, n_2 \geq 4$, otherwise S is either not a $\gamma_t^d(G)$-set or $N(v) \cap S \neq \emptyset$ both of which are contradictions. Hence, $n \geq 9$. Observe that each vertex in $N(v)$ has exactly one vertex at distance 2 from it in $V(G) \setminus N(v)$. Hence, since $N(v) \cap S = \emptyset$ every vertex in $N(v)$ is totally dominated by S. Furthermore, by the same argument, if $x \in N(v)$, then the neighbor of x in $N(x) \setminus \{v\}$ is contained in S. Suppose $n_1 = 5$. Then, $\{u_2, u_3\} \subset S$ and $|S \cap V(F_1)| = \gamma_t^d(F_1)$, a contradiction. Suppose $n_1 = 6$. Then, $\{u_2, u_3, u_4\} \subset S$ and $|S \cap V(F_1)| = \gamma_t^d(F_1)$, a contradiction. By symmetry, $n_2 \notin \{5, 6\}$. Hence, for $i = 1, 2$, suppose $n_i \geq 7$. Thus, $\{v_2, v_3, v_{n-2}, v_{n-3}\} \subset S$ and $\{u_2, u_3, u_{n-2}, u_{n-3}\} \subset S$. It follows that $|S \cap V(F_i)| \geq 4$. Then, by Proposition 8 and the fact that $|S \cap V(F_i)| \leq \gamma_t^d(F_i) - 1$, $n_i \geq 10$ for $i = 1, 2$.

We now show that there is a $\gamma_t^d(G)$-set, S^*, which contains the vertices u_{2+5j} and u_{3+5j} for $j \in \{0, \dots, \lfloor (n_1 + 1)/5 \rfloor - 1\}$. We proceed by induction on $j \geq 0$. Suppose that for $j^* \leq j' = j - 1 < j$, the set S contains the required vertices, and so $\{u_{2+5j'}, u_{3+5j'}\} \subset S$ but the vertices u_{2+5j} and u_{3+5j} are not necessarily contained in S. If $j = 0$, then the result is true, since $\{u_2, u_3\} \subset S$. This establishes the base case. Note that by our assumptions $\{u_{n_1-1}, u_{n_1-2}\} \subset S$, regardless. Let $T = \{u_{4+5j'}, u_{5+5j'}, u_{6+5j'}\}$.

Suppose $n_1 \equiv 0 \pmod 5$. Then, $u_{2+5j} = u_{n_1-3}$ and $u_{3+5j} = u_{n_1-2}$. Thus, $u_{3+5j} \in S$. Suppose $S \cap T = \emptyset$. Then, since S is a DTD-set of G, $u_{2+5j} = u_{n_1-3} \in S$, and $S^* = S$ contains the required vertices. Hence, $S \cap T \neq \emptyset$. Suppose $|S \cap T| \geq 2$, then $S^* = (S \setminus T) \cup \{u_{2+5j}\}$ is a DTD-set of G of smaller cardinality than S, a contradiction. Hence $|S \cap T| = 1$. In that case, $S^* = (S \setminus T) \cup \{u_{2+5j}\}$ is a $\gamma_t^d(G)$-set which contains the required vertices.

Suppose $n_1 \equiv 1 \pmod 5$. Then, $u_{2+5j} = u_{n_1-4}$ and $u_{3+5j} = u_{n_1-3}$. Suppose $S \cap T = \emptyset$. Then, since S is a DTD-set of G, $\{u_{2+5j}, u_{3+5j}\} \subset S$, and $S^* = S$ contains the required vertices. Hence, $S \cap T \neq \emptyset$. Suppose $|S \cap T| = 3$. Then, $S^* = (S \setminus T) \cup \{u_{2+5j}, u_{3+5j}\}$, is a DTD-set of G of smaller cardinality than S, a contradiction. Suppose $|S \cap T| = 2$. Then, $S^* = (S \setminus T) \cup \{u_{2+5j}, u_{3+5j}\}$, is a $\gamma_t^d(G)$-set which contains the required vertices. Hence, $|S \cap T| = 1$. Assume $u_{4+5j'} \in S$. Then, $u_{3+5j} \in S$, otherwise S is not a DTD-set of G, a contradiction. Then, let $S^* = (S \setminus \{u_{4+5j'}\}) \cup \{u_{2+5j}\}$. Assume $u_{5+5j'} \in S$. Then, $u_{2+5j} \in S$, otherwise S is not a DTD-set of G, a contradiction. Then, let $S^* = (S \setminus \{u_{5+5j'}\}) \cup \{u_{3+5j}\}$. Assume $u_{6+5j'} \in S$. Then, $u_{2+5j} \in S$, otherwise S is not a DTD-set of G, a contradiction. Then, let $S^* = (S \setminus \{u_{5+5j'}\}) \cup \{u_{3+5j}\}$. In each case S^* is a $\gamma_t^d(G)$-set which contains the required vertices.

Suppose $n_1 \equiv 2 \pmod 5$. Then, $u_{2+5j} = u_{n_1-5}$ and $u_{3+5j} = u_{n_1-4}$. Suppose $S \cap T = \emptyset$. Then, since S is a DTD-set of G, $\{u_{2+5j}, u_{3+5j}\} \subset S$, and $S^* = S$ contains the required vertices. Hence, $S \cap T \neq \emptyset$. Suppose $|S \cap T| = 3$, then $S^* = (S \setminus T) \cup \{u_{2+5j}, u_{3+5j}\}$, is a DTD-set of G of smaller cardinality than S, a contradiction. Suppose $|S \cap T| = 2$, then $S^* = (S \setminus T) \cup \{u_{2+5j}, u_{3+5j}\}$, is a $\gamma_t^d(G)$-set which contains the required vertices. Hence, $|S \cap T| = 1$. Let $R_1 = \{u_{2+5j}, u_{3+5j}, u_{4+5j}\}$. We must have $|S \cap R_1| = 1$, otherwise S is not a $\gamma_t^d(G)$-set, a contradiction. In each possible case $S^* = (S \setminus (T \cup R_1)) \cup \{u_{2+5j}, u_{3+5j}\}$ is a $\gamma_t^d(G)$-set which contains the required vertices.

Suppose $n_1 \equiv 3 \pmod 5$. Then, $u_{2+5j} = u_{n_1-6}$ and $u_{3+5j} = u_{n_1-5}$. Suppose $S \cap T = \emptyset$. Then, since S is a DTD-set of G, $\{u_{2+5j}, u_{3+5j}\} \subset S$, and $S^* = S$ contains the required vertices. Hence, $S \cap T \neq \emptyset$. Suppose $|S \cap T| = 3$, then $S^* = (S \setminus T) \cup \{u_{2+5j}, u_{3+5j}\}$, is a DTD-set of G of smaller cardinality than S, a contradiction. Suppose $|S \cap T| = 2$, then $S^* = (S \setminus T) \cup \{u_{2+5j}, u_{3+5j}\}$, is a $\gamma_t^d(G)$-set which contains the required vertices. Hence, $|S \cap T| = 1$. Let $R_2 = \{u_{2+5j}, u_{3+5j}, u_{4+5j}\} = \{u_{n_1-6}, u_{n_1-5}, u_{n_1-4}\}$. We must have $|S \cap R_2| = 1$, otherwise S is not a $\gamma_t^d(G)$-set, a contradiction. In each possible case $S^* = (S \setminus (T \cup R_2)) \cup \{u_{2+5j}, u_{3+5j}\}$ is a $\gamma_t^d(G)$-set which contains the required vertices.

Suppose $n_1 \equiv 4 \pmod 5$. Then, $u_{2+5j} = u_{n_1-2}$ and $u_{3+5j} = u_{n_1-1}$. Thus, $S^* = S$ by our previous assumptions and the inductive hypothesis, and so we are done.

We now use this result to obtain a contradiction. Let $X = S^* \cap V(F_1)$ and consider $|X|$. If $n_1 \equiv 0 \pmod 5$, then $|X| = 2\lfloor (n_1+1)/5 \rfloor + 1$. If $n_1 \equiv 1$, 2 or $3 \pmod 5$, then $|X| = 2\lfloor (n_1+1)/5 \rfloor + 2$. If $n_1 \equiv 4 \pmod 5$, then $|X| = 2\lfloor (n_1+1)/5 \rfloor = 2(n_1+1)/5$. We may rewrite $|X|$ as : $|X| = 2(n_1+1)/5$ if $(n_1+1) \equiv 0 \pmod 5$ and $|X| = \lceil 2(n_1+2)/5 \rceil$ otherwise. Then, by Proposition 8, in each case, $|X| = \gamma_t^d(F_1) > \gamma_t^d(F_1) - 1$, a contradiction. □

We now return to the proof of Proposition 34. Suppose v is not contained in any $\gamma_t^d(G)$ and no $\gamma_t^d(G)$-set totally dominates v. Let S be a $\gamma_t^d(G)$-set. Then, S disjunctively dominates v and $v \notin S$. Assume that the result is true for all daisies with $k' \leq k-1 < k$ petals. By Claim N, $k \geq 3$. Let G' be a daisy obtained from G by removing every small vertex (vertex of degree 2) of a single petal so that G' has $2 \leq k' < k$ petals. By the inductive hypothesis, there is a $\gamma_t^d(G')$-set, S', which totally dominates v. Let $X = S \cap V(G')$ and let $Y = S \cap (V(G) \setminus V(G'))$. Since v is disjunctively dominated by S, $d(X,Y) \geq 4$, and so X and Y DT-dominate G' and $G - V(G')$ respectively. Furthermore, we must have $|S'| = |X|$. Then, $(S \setminus X) \cup S'$ is a $\gamma_t^d(G')$-set which totally dominates v. □

Proposition 9 *If G is a daisy of order n, then $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq (n-1)/2$. Furthermore, $\gamma_t^d(G) = (n-1)/2$ if and only if $G \in \mathcal{D}$.*

Proof of Proposition 9. Let G be a daisy of order n with k petals. We first establish the following claim.

Claim O $k \geq 3$.

Proof of Claim O. We show that the desired result is true if $k = 2$.

Suppose $k = 2$. The sufficiency is straightforward to check. In order to prove the necessity, we proceed by induction on n. If $n = 5$, then $G = D(3,3) \in \mathcal{D}$ and $\gamma_t^d(G) = 2 = (n-1)/2$. If $n = 6$, then $G = D(3,4)$ and $\gamma_t^d(G) = 2 < (n-1)/2$. If $n = 7$, then $G = D(3,5)$ and $\gamma_t^d(G) = 2 < (n-1)/2$ or $G = D(4,4) \in \mathcal{D}$ and $\gamma_t^d(G) = 3 = (n-1)/2$. Hence, $n \geq 8$ otherwise we are done.

Let $G = D(n_1+1, n_2+1)$ so $n = n_1+n_2+1$. Let v denote the vertex of degree 4 in G. Let F_1 and F_2 denote the two cycles passing through v where $F_i \cong C_{n_i+1}$ for $i = 1, 2$. Let F_1 be the cycle $vv_1 \dots v_{n_1}v$ and let F_2 be the cycle $vu_1 \dots u_{n_2}v$. Let $S_1 = \{v_i \mid i \equiv 0 \text{ or } 1 \pmod 5\}$ and let S_2 be a $\gamma_t^d(F_2)$-set that contains v and v_1. By Proposition 8, $|S_2| = 2(n_2+1)/5$ if $n_2 \equiv 4 \pmod 5$ and $|S_2| = \lceil 2(n_2+2)/5 \rceil$ otherwise. Let D_1 be a $\gamma_t^d(F_1)$-set which contains v and u_1 and let $D_2 = \{v_i \mid i \equiv 0 \text{ or } 4 \pmod 5\}$. By Proposition 8, $|D_1| = 2(n_1+1)/5$ if $n_1 \equiv 4 \pmod 5$ and $|D_1| = \lceil 2(n_1+2)/5 \rceil$ otherwise.

Suppose $n_1 \equiv 4 \pmod 5$. Then, $|S_1| = (2n_1-3)/5$. If $n_2 \equiv 0,\ 2,\ 3$ or $4 \pmod 5$, then $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq |S_1 \cup S_2| \leq (2n+1)/5 < (n-1)/2$. On the other hand, if $n_2 \equiv 1 \pmod 5$, then $|D_1| = 2(n_1+1)/5$ and $|D_2| = 2(n_2-1)/5$ implying that $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq |D_1 \cup D_2| \leq (2n-2)/5 < (n-1)/2$. Hence, $n_i \not\equiv 4 \pmod 5$ for $i = 1, 2$.

Suppose $n_1 \equiv 0 \pmod 5$. Then, $|S_1| = 2n_1/5$. If $n_2 \equiv 0$ or $3 \pmod 5$, then $T = S_1 \cup (S_2 \setminus \{v\})$ is a DTD-set of G and $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq |T| \leq 2(n-1)/5 < (n-1)/2$. If $n_2 \equiv 1$ or $2 \pmod 5$, then $|D_1| = (2n_1+5)/5$ and $|D_2| \leq 2(n_2-1)/5$. Since $D_1 \cup D_2$ is a DTD-set of G it follows that $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq (2n+1)/5 < (n-1)/2$. Hence, $n_i \not\equiv 0 \pmod 5$ for $i = 1, 2$ and, further, $n \geq 9$.

Suppose $n_1 \equiv 3 \pmod 5$. Then, $|D_1| = (2n_1+2)/5$. If $n_2 \equiv 1, 2$ or $3 \pmod 5$, then $|D_2| \leq 2(n_2-1)/5$ and $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq |D_1 \cup D_2| \leq (2n-1)/5 < (n-1)/2$. Hence, $n_i \not\equiv 3 \pmod 5$ for $i = 1, 2$.

Suppose $n_1 \equiv 2 \pmod 5$. Then, $|D_1| = (2n_1+6)/5$. If $n_2 \equiv 2 \pmod 5$, then $|D_2| = (2n_2-4)/5$ and $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq |D_1 \cup D_2| \leq 2n/5 < (n-1)/2$. If $n_2 \equiv 1 \pmod 5$, then $|D_2| = (2n_2-2)/5$ and $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq |D_1 \cup D_2| \leq (2n+2)/5 \leq (n-1)/2$ with equality if and only if $G = D(3,7) \in \mathcal{D}$. Hence, $n_i \not\equiv 2 \pmod 5$ for $i = 1, 2$.

Finally, suppose $n_i \equiv 1 \pmod 5$ for $i = 1, 2$. Then, $n \geq 13$ since $D(7,7)$ is the graph of smallest order with $n_i \equiv 1 \pmod 5$ for $i = 1, 2$. Let $R_1 = \{u_i \mid i \equiv 2 \text{ or } 3 \pmod 5\}$ and $R_2 = \{v_i \mid i \equiv 2 \text{ or } 3 \pmod 5\}$. Then $|R_1| = 2(n_1 - 1)/5$ and $|R_2| = 2(n_2 - 1)/5$. The set $|R_1 \cup R_2| \cup \{v\}$ is DTD-set of G. Hence, $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq 2(n_1 - 1)/5 + 2(n_2 - 1)/5 + 1 = (2n - 1)/5 < (n - 1)/2$. Thus, $k \geq 3$. □

We now return to the proof of Proposition 9. We proceed by induction on n. Assume that for all daisies of order less than n the result is true. By Claim O, $k \geq 3$, and so $n \geq 7$. If $n = 7$, then $G = D(3,3,3)$ with $\gamma_t^d(G) = 2 < (n-1)/2$, as required. Hence, $n \geq 8$.

Let v denote the vertex of degree $2k$ in G, and let F_1, $F_2, \ldots, F_k$ denote the k cycles passing through v, where $F_i \cong C_{n_i+1}$ for $i = 1, 2 \ldots k$. Thus, $n = 1 + \sum_{i=1}^{k} n_i$. Let F_1 be the cycle $vv_1 \ldots v_{n_1}v$.

Let $G' = D(n_2, \ldots, n_k)$. Then, G' is a daisy of order $n' = n - n_1$ with $k - 1 \geq 2$ petals. Applying the inductive hypothesis to G', we have $\gamma_t^d(G') \leq (n' - 1)/2$ with equality if and only if $G' \in \mathcal{D}$. Let S' be a $\gamma_t^d(G')$-set.

Suppose $v \in S'$. If $n_1 = 2$, then S' is a DTD-set of G, and so $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq |S'| < (n-1)/2$. Hence, $n_1 \geq 3$. We now extend S' to a DTD-set of G as follows. If $n_1 \equiv 0$ or $4 \pmod 5$, then let $S_1 = \{v_i \mid i \equiv 0 \text{ or } 1 \pmod 5\}$. If $n_1 \equiv 1$ or $2 \pmod 5$, then let $S_1 = \{v_i \mid i \equiv 3 \text{ or } 4 \pmod 5\}$. If $n_1 \equiv 3 \pmod 5$, then let $S_1 = \{v_i \mid i \equiv 0 \text{ or } 4 \pmod 5\}$. Then, $|S_1| \leq 2n_1/5$ and $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq |S' \cup S_1| \leq (n' - 1)/2 + 2n_1/5 \leq (n-1)/2 - n_1/10 \leq (n-1)/2$. Further, if $\gamma_t^d(G) = (n-1)/2$ we must have equality throughout this inequality chain. In particular, $\gamma_t^d(G) = (n' - 1)/2$ and $n_1 = 0$. However, this contradicts Claim O, implying $\gamma_t^d(G) < (n-1)/2$ for all daisies with $k \geq 3$ and $v \in S'$.

Suppose $v \notin S'$. We may suppose that no $\gamma_t^d(G')$-set contains v, for otherwise, we are done. For $2 \leq i \leq k$, in each cycle F_i we require that $|S' \cap V(F_i)| \leq \gamma_t^d(F_i) - 1$, otherwise the restriction of S' to the vertices of some cycle in G' is a DTD-set of that cycle and we may then choose $v \in S'$, a contradiction. Further, since each graph $H \in \mathcal{D}$ has a $\gamma_t^d(H)$-set which contains v, if $v \notin S'$ then $G' \notin \mathcal{D}$. Hence, $G' \notin \mathcal{D}$ and so $\gamma_t^d(G') = |S'| \leq (n' - 2)/2$.

Now, by Proposition 34, v is totally dominated in G'. Let S_1 be defined as before. Suppose $n_1 \equiv 1 \pmod 5$. Then, $S' \cup S_1$ is a DTD-set of G and so $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq (n'-2)/2 + 2(n_1 - 1)/5 = (n-2)/2 - (n_1 + 2)/10 < (n-1)/2$. Suppose $n_1 \equiv 3$ or $4 \pmod 5$. Then, $S_1 \cup S' \cup \{v\}$ is a DTD-set of G and so $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq 2(n_1-2)/5+1+(n'-2)/2 = (n-2)/2+(2-n_1)/10 < (n-1)/2$, where the last inequality follows from the fact that $n_1 \geq 2$. Since F_1 was chosen arbitrarily, it follows that G' contains no cycle such that $n_i \equiv 1$, 2 or $3 \pmod 5$. By Proposition 8, $\gamma_t^d(F_i) = 2n_i/5 + 1$ if $n_i \equiv 0 \pmod 5$ and $\gamma_t^d(F_i) = 2(n_i + 1)/5$ if $n_i \equiv 4 \pmod 5$. Therefore $|S'| \leq \sum_{i=2}^{k}(\gamma_t^d(F_i) - 1) \leq \sum_{i=2}^{k}(2n_i/5) = 2(n - n_1 - 1)/5$. Let S_1^* be a $\gamma_t^d(F_1)$-set which includes v if $n_1 \equiv 4 \pmod 5$ and let $S_1^* = S_1$ if $n_1 \equiv 0 \pmod 5$. The set $S_1^* \cup S'$ is a DTD-set of G and so $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq 2(n_1 + 1)/5 + 2(n - n_1 - 1)/5 = 2n/5 < (n-1)/2$, as required. □

In order to prove our next result we require the value of the minimum disjunctive total domination number of a key. Let $G = L_{r,s}$ be the key formed by joining a vertex from a cycle on r vertices to a leaf vertex of a path on s vertices. Let $n = r + s$ be the order of G. Then, $\gamma_t^d(G)$ is given by Table 3 and the value of $\gamma_t^d(G)$ has been computed using Propositions 8 and 33. Further, let y be the leaf vertex in G and let x be the neighbor of y. The vertex x is contained in every $\gamma_t^d(G)$-set. The entries followed by a star $(*)$ denote that there is a $\gamma_t^d(G)$-set which contains y. The entries followed by a star $(*)$ and a dagger $(\dagger)$ denote that there is a $\gamma_t^d(G)$-set, S, such that $y \in S$ and the set $S \setminus \{x\}$ DT-dominates the subgraph $G - y$ of G. The entries followed by a dagger $(\dagger)$ denote that there is a $\gamma_t^d(G)$-set, S, $y \notin S$, and the set $S \setminus \{x\}$ DT-dominates the subgraph $G - y$ of G. The double daggered entries denote that there is a $\gamma_t^d(G - \{x, y\})$-set with $\gamma_t^d(G - \{x, y\}) = \gamma_t^d(G) - 2$.

	s				
r	$\equiv 0 \pmod 5$	$\equiv 1 \pmod 5$	$\equiv 2 \pmod 5$	$\equiv 3 \pmod 5$	$\equiv 4 \pmod 5$
$\equiv 0 \pmod 5$	$2n/5^*$	$2(n-1)/5$	$\lceil 2n/5 \rceil^\dagger$	$\lceil 2n/5 \rceil^{*\dagger\ddagger}$	$\lceil 2n/5 \rceil^{*\dagger}$
$\equiv 1 \pmod 5$	$\lceil 2(n+1)/5 \rceil^{*\dagger}$	$\lceil 2n/5 \rceil^*$	$\lceil 2(n-1)/5 \rceil$	$\lceil 2n/5 \rceil^\dagger$	$\lceil 2(n+1)/5 \rceil^{*\dagger\ddagger}$
$\equiv 2 \pmod 5$	$\lceil 2(n+1)/5 \rceil^{*\dagger\ddagger}$	$\lceil 2n/5 \rceil^{*\dagger}$	$\lceil 2(n-1)/5 \rceil^*$	$\lceil 2n/5 \rceil$	$\lceil 2(n+1)/5 \rceil^\dagger$
$\equiv 3 \pmod 5$	$\lceil 2(n+1)/5 \rceil^{*\dagger}$	$\lceil 2n/5 \rceil^*$	$\lceil 2(n-1)/5 \rceil$	$\lceil 2n/5 \rceil^\dagger$	$\lceil 2(n+1)/5 \rceil^{*\dagger\ddagger}$
$\equiv 4 \pmod 5$	$\lceil 2(n+1)/5 \rceil^*$	$\lceil 2n/5 \rceil^*$	$\lceil 2(n-1)/5 \rceil$	$\lceil 2n/5 \rceil^\dagger$	$\lceil 2(n+1)/5 \rceil^{*\dagger\ddagger}$

Table 3: The Disjunctive Total Domination Number of $L_{r,s}$ where $n = r + s$ and $r \neq 4$.

We are now in a position to prove Proposition 10. Recall its statement.

Proposition 10 *If G is a dumb-bell of order n, then $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq n/2$. Furthermore, $\gamma_t^d(G) \geq (n-1)/2$ if and only if $G \in \mathcal{D}_b \cup \mathcal{G}_b$.*

Proof of Proposition 10. Let $G = D_b(n_1, n_2, \ell)$ be a dumb-bell of order $n = n_1 + n_2 + \ell$. We proceed with the following claim.

Claim P $\ell \geq 1$.

Proof of Claim P. We show that if $\ell = 0$, then the desired result follows.

Suppose $\ell = 0$. Then, $G = D_b(n_1, n_2)$ and $n = n_1 + n_2$. If $G \in \mathcal{D}_b \cup \mathcal{G}_b$, then $G \in \{D_b(3,4), D_b(4,4), D_b(4,5)\}$ and it may be verified that $\gamma_t^d(G) \geq (n-1)/2$. In order to prove the necessity, we proceed by induction on the order $n \geq 6$ of G. Let $F_1 \cong C_{n_1}$ and $F_2 \cong C_{n_2}$ be the two cycles of G. Let $F_1 = uu_1 \ldots u_{n_1-1}u$ and let $F_2 = vv_1 \ldots v_{n_2-1}v$. Let uv be the edge joining the cycles F_1 and F_2 in G. Let S_1 be a $\gamma_t^d(F_1)$-set which contains u. Let S_2 be a $\gamma_t^d(F_2)$-set which contains v. By Proposition 8, for $i = 1, 2$, $|S_i| = 2n_i/5$ if $n_i \equiv 0 \pmod 5$ and $|S_i| = \lceil 2(n_i+1)/5 \rceil$ otherwise. Let $D_1 = \{u_i \mid i \equiv 0 \text{ or } 1 \pmod 5\}$ and $D_2 = \{v_i \mid i \equiv 0 \text{ or } 1 \pmod 5\}$. Let $R_1 = \{u_i \mid i \equiv 3 \text{ or } 4 \pmod 5\}$ and $R_2 = \{v_i \mid i \equiv 3 \text{ or } 4 \pmod 5\}$. Let $T_1 = \{u_i \mid i \equiv 0 \text{ or } 4 \pmod 5\}$ and $T_2 = \{v_i \mid i \equiv 0 \text{ or } 4 \pmod 5\}$. If

$n = 6$, then $G = D_b(3,3)$ and $\gamma_t^d(G) = 2 < (n-1)/2$. If $n = 7$, then $G = D_b(3,4)$ and $\gamma_t^d(G) = 3 = (n-1)/2$. In both cases the result holds, hence $n \geq 8$.

Suppose $n_1 = 4$. Then $n = n_2 + 4 \geq 8$. If $n_2 \equiv 0 \,(\mathrm{mod}\, 5)$, then $S_1 \cup S_2$ is a DTD-set of G and $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq |S_1 \cup S_2| = 2n_2/5 + 2 = 2(n+1)/5 \leq (n-1)/2$. Further, we have equality if and only if $G = D_b(4,5)$. If $n_2 \equiv 1 \,(\mathrm{mod}\, 5)$, then $S_1 \cup D_2$ is a DTD-set of G and $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq |S_1 \cup D_2| = 2(n_2-1)/5 + 2 = 2(n-5)/5 + 2 = 2n/5 < (n-1)/2$. If $n_2 \equiv 2 \,(\mathrm{mod}\, 5)$, then $S_1 \cup R_2$ is a DTD-set of G and $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq |S_1 \cup R_2| = 2(n_2-2)/5 + 2 = 2(n-6)/5 + 2 = 2(n-1)/5 < (n-1)/2$. If $n_2 = 4$, then $G = D_b(4,4)$. Otherwise, if $n_2 \equiv 3$ or $4 \,(\mathrm{mod}\, 5)$, then $n \geq 12$, and $S_1 \cup T_2 \cup \{v\}$ is a DTD-set of G implying that $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq |S_1 \cup T_2 \cup \{v\}| \leq 2(n_2-3)/5 + 3 = 2(n-7)/5 + 3 = (2n+1)/5 < (n-1)/2$. Hence, $n_i \neq 4$ for $i = 1, 2$.

Suppose $n_1 \equiv 0 \,(\mathrm{mod}\, 5)$. If $n_2 \equiv 0 \,(\mathrm{mod}\, 5)$, then $S_1 \cup S_2$ is a DTD-set of G and $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq |S_1 \cup S_2| = 2n_1/5 + 2n_2/5 = 2n/5 < (n-1)/2$. If $n_2 \equiv 1 \,(\mathrm{mod}\, 5)$, then $S_1 \cup D_2$ is a DTD-set of G and $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq |S_1 \cup D_2| = 2n_1/5 + 2(n_2-1)/5 = (2n-1)/5 < (n-1)/2$. If $n_2 \equiv 2 \,(\mathrm{mod}\, 5)$, then $S_1 \cup R_2$ is a DTD-set of G and $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq |S_1 \cup R_2| = 2n_1/5 + 2(n_2-2)/5 = 2(n-2)/5 < (n-1)/2$. Otherwise, if $n_2 \equiv 3$ or $4 \,(\mathrm{mod}\, 5)$, $S_1 \cup T_2 \cup \{v\}$ is a DTD-set of G and $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq |S_1 \cup T_2| + 1 \leq 2n_1/5 + 2(n_2-3)/5 + 1 = (2n-1)/5 < (n-1)/2$. Hence, $n_i \not\equiv 0 \,(\mathrm{mod}\, 5)$ for $i = 1, 2$.

Suppose $n_1 \equiv 1 \,(\mathrm{mod}\, 5)$. If $n_2 \equiv 1 \,(\mathrm{mod}\, 5)$, then $S_1 \cup D_2$ is a DTD-set of G and $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq |S_1 \cup D_2| = 2(n_1-1)/5 + 2(n_2-1)/5 + 1 = (2n+1)/5 < (n-1)/2$. If $n_2 \equiv 2 \,(\mathrm{mod}\, 5)$, then $S_1 \cup R_2$ is a DTD-set of G and $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq |S_1 \cup R_2| = 2(n_1-1)/5 + 2(n_2-2)/5 + 1 = (2n-1)/5 < (n-1)/2$. Otherwise, if $n_2 \equiv 3$ or $4 \,(\mathrm{mod}\, 5)$, $D_1 \cup T_2 \cup \{v\}$ is a DTD-set of G and $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq |D_1 \cup T_2 \cup \{v\}| \leq 2(n_1-1)/5 + 2(n_2-3)/5 + 1 = (2n-3)/5 < (n-1)/2$. Hence, $n_i \not\equiv 1 \,(\mathrm{mod}\, 5)$ for $i = 1, 2$ and, further, $n \geq 10$.

Suppose $n_1 \equiv 2 \,(\mathrm{mod}\, 5)$. If $n_2 \equiv 2 \,(\mathrm{mod}\, 5)$, then $R_1 \cup R_2 \cup \{u, v\}$ is a DTD-set of G and $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq |R_1 \cup R_2 \cup \{u,v\}| = 2(n_1-2)/5 + 2(n_2-2)/5 + 2 = 2(n+1)/5 < (n-1)/2$. Otherwise, if $n_2 \equiv 3$ or $4 \,(\mathrm{mod}\, 5)$, $R_1 \cup T_2 \cup \{u, v\}$ is a DTD-set of G and $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq |R_1 \cup T_2 \cup \{u,v\}| \leq 2(n_1-2)/5 + 2(n_2-3)/5 + 2 = 2n/5 < (n-1)/2$. Hence, $n_i \not\equiv 2 \,(\mathrm{mod}\, 5)$ for $i = 1, 2$ and, further, $n \geq 11$.

Suppose $n_1 \equiv 3 \,(\mathrm{mod}\, 5)$. If $n_2 \equiv 3$ or $4 \,(\mathrm{mod}\, 5)$, then $T_1 \cup T_2 \cup \{u, v\}$ is a DTD-set of G and $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq |T_1 \cup T_2 \cup \{u,v\}| \leq 2(n_1-3)/5 + 2(n_2-3)/5 + 2 = 2(n-1)/5 < (n-1)/2$. Hence, $n_i \not\equiv 3 \,(\mathrm{mod}\, 5)$ for $i = 1, 2$ and, further, $n \geq 18$.

Suppose $n_i \equiv 4 \,(\mathrm{mod}\, 5)$ for $i = 1, 2$. Then, $T_1 \cup T_2 \cup \{u, v\}$ is a DTD-set of G and $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq |T_1 \cup T_2 \cup \{u,v\}| \leq 2(n_1-4)/5 + 2(n_2-4)/5 + 2 = 2(n-3)/5 < (n-1)/2$. □

We now return to the proof of Proposition 10. If $G \in \mathcal{D}_b \cup \mathcal{G}_b$, then it is straightforward to check that $\gamma_t^d(G) \geq (n-1)/2$. In order to prove the necessity, let G be such that $\gamma_t^d(G) \geq (n-1)/2$. By Claim P, $\ell \geq 1$. Hence $G = D_b(n_1, n_2, \ell)$ and $n \geq 7$. Let G_1 and G_2 denote the two cycles in G where $G_i \cong C_{n_i}$ for $i = 1, 2$. Let $uw_1 \ldots w_\ell v$ be the path joining G_1 to G_2 where $u \in V(G_1)$ and $v \in V(G_2)$. Let $G_2 = vv_1 \ldots v_{n_1-1}v$. Let $F = G - V(G_2)$. Then, F is a key $L_{n_1,\ell}$. Let F have order n_F, and so $n_F = n_1 + \ell = n - n_2$.

Let S_1 be a $\gamma_t^d(F)$-set and choose S_1 to contain the leaf vertex w_ℓ of F if possible. Then, $|S_1|$ is given by Table 3. Further, $w_{\ell-1} \in S_1$. Let $R_1 = S_1 \setminus \{w_{\ell-1}\}$. Then, $|R_1| = |S_1| - 1$. Let D_1 be a $\gamma_t^d(F - \{w_{\ell-1}, w_\ell\})$-set, possibly $|D_1| = |S_1| - 1$ or $|D_1| = |S_1| - 2$. Let S_2 be a $\gamma_t^d(G_2)$-set which contains v. By Proposition 8, $|S_2| = 2n_2/5$ if $n \equiv 0 \,(\mathrm{mod}\, 5)$, and $|S_2| = \lceil 2(n+1)/5 \rceil$ otherwise. Let $D_2 = \{v_i \mid i \equiv 0 \text{ or } 1 \,(\mathrm{mod}\, 5)\}$. Let $R_2 = \{v_i \mid i \equiv 3 \text{ or } 4 \,(\mathrm{mod}\, 5)\}$. Let $T_2 = \{v_i \mid i \equiv 0 \text{ or } 4 \,(\mathrm{mod}\, 5)\}$. We proceed with the following series of claims.

Claim Q.1 *If $n_1 \equiv 0 \,(\mathrm{mod}\, 5)$, then $G \in \{D_b(3,5,1)\} \subset G_b$.*

Proof of Claim Q.1 Suppose $n_1 \equiv 0 \,(\mathrm{mod}\, 5)$. We examine each possibility for ℓ in turn.

Suppose $\ell \equiv 0 \,(\mathrm{mod}\, 5)$. Then, $n \geq 9$. By Table 3, $|S_1| = 2(n_1 + \ell)/5$ and S_1 contains w_ℓ. If $n_2 \equiv 0 \,(\mathrm{mod}\, 5)$, then $S_1 \cup S_2$ is DTD-set of G and $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq |S_1 \cup S_2| = 2n/5 < (n-1)/2$, a contradiction. If $n_2 \equiv 1 \,(\mathrm{mod}\, 5)$, then $S_1 \cup D_2$ is a DTD-set of G, and $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq |S_1 \cup D_2| = 2(n_1+\ell)/5 + 2(n_2-1)/5 = 2(n-1)/5 < (n-1)/2$, a contradiction. If $n_2 \equiv 2 \,(\mathrm{mod}\, 5)$, then $S_1 \cup R_2$ is a DTD-set of G, and $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq |S_1 \cup R_2| = 2(n_1+\ell)/5 + 2(n_2-2)/5 = 2(n-2)/5$, a contradiction. If $G_2 = C_4$, then $S_1 \cup S_2$ is a DTD-set of G, and $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq |S_1 \cup S_2| = 2(n-4)/5 + 2 = 2(n+1)/5 < (n-1)/2$, a contradiction. If $n_2 \equiv 3$ or $4 \,(\mathrm{mod}\, 5)$, then $S_1 \cup T_2 \cup \{v\}$ is a DTD-set of G, and $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq |S_1 \cup T_2 \cup \{v\}| \leq 2(n_1+\ell)/5 + 2(n_2-3)/5 + 1 = (2n-1)/5 < (n-1)/2$, a contradiction.

Suppose $\ell \equiv 1 \,(\mathrm{mod}\, 5)$. By Table 3, $|S_1| = 2(n_1 + \ell - 1)/5$. If $n_2 \equiv 0 \,(\mathrm{mod}\, 5)$, then $S_1 \cup S_2$ is a DTD-set of G, and $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq |S_1 \cup S_2| = 2(n_1 + \ell - 1)/5 + 2n_2/5 = 2(n-1)/5 < (n-1)/2$, a contradiction. If $n_2 \equiv 1 \,(\mathrm{mod}\, 5)$, then $S_1 \cup S_2$ is a DTD-set of G, and so $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq |S_1 \cup S_2| = 2(n_1 + \ell - 1)/5 + 2(n_2 - 1)/5 + 1 = 2(n-2)/5 + 1 = (2n+1)/5 < (n-1)/2$, a contradiction. If $n_2 \equiv 2 \,(\mathrm{mod}\, 5)$, then $S_1 \cup R_2 \cup \{w_\ell\}$ is a DTD-set of G, and $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq |S_1 \cup R_2 \cup \{w_\ell\}| = 2(n_1 + \ell - 1)/5 + 2(n_2 - 2)/5 + 1 = 2(n-3)/5 + 1 = (2n-1)/5 < (n-1)/2$, a contradiction. If $G_2 = C_4$, then $S_1 \cup S_2$ is a DTD-set of G, and $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq |S_1 \cup S_2| = 2(n_1 + \ell - 1)/5 + 2 = 2(n-5)/5 + 2 = 2n/5 < (n-1)/2$, a contradiction. Otherwise, if $n_2 \equiv 3$ or $4 (\mathrm{mod}\, 5)$, then $S_1 \cup S_2$ is a DTD-set of G, and $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq |S_1 \cup S_2| = 2(n_1 + \ell - 1)/5 + 2(n_2 - 3)/5 + 2 = 2(n+1)/5 \leq (n-1)/2$. We have equality if $n = 9$ and $G = D_b(3,5,1) = G_1(1,0) \in \mathcal{G}_b$ otherwise $\gamma_t^d(G) < (n-1)/2$, a contradiction.

Suppose $\ell \equiv 2 \,(\mathrm{mod}\, 5)$. Then, $n \geq 10$. By Table 3, $|S_1| = \lceil 2(n_1+\ell)/5 \rceil = (2(n_1+\ell)+1)/5$. Further, $|R_1| = |S_1| - 1$ and R_1 DT-dominates $F - w_\ell$. If $n_2 \equiv 0 \,(\mathrm{mod}\, 5)$, then $R_1 \cup S_2$ is a DTD-set of G, and $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq |R_1 \cup S_2| = (2(n_1+\ell)+1)/5 + 2n_2/5 - 1 = (2n-4)/5 < (n-1)/2$, a contradiction. If $n_2 \equiv 1 \,(\mathrm{mod}\, 5)$, then $R_1 \cup S_2$ is a DTD-set of G, and $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq |R_1 \cup S_2| = (2(n_1+\ell)+1)/5 + 2(n_2-1)/5 = (2n-1)/5 < (n-1)/2$, a contradiction. If $n_2 \equiv 2 \,(\mathrm{mod}\, 5)$, then $S_1 \cup R_2$ is a DTD-set of G, and $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq |S_1 \cup R_2| = (2(n_1+\ell)+1)/5 + 2(n_2-2)/5 - 1 = (2n-3)/5 < (n-1)/2$, a contradiction. If $n_2 \equiv 3$ or $4 \,(\mathrm{mod}\, 5)$, then $|R_1 \cup S_2|$ is a DTD-set of G, and $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq |R_1 \cup S_2| \leq (2(n_1 + \ell) + 1)/5 + 2(n_2 - 3)/5 = 2n/5 < (n-1)/2$, a contradiction.

Suppose $\ell \equiv 3 \,(\mathrm{mod}\, 5)$. Then, $n \geq 11$. By Table 3 $|S_1| = 2(n_1 + \ell + 2)/5$. Further, $|D_1| = |S_1| - 2$. If $n_2 \equiv 0,\ 1,\ 2,\ 3$ or $4 \,(\mathrm{mod}\, 5)$, then $D_1 \cup S_2$ is a DTD-set of G, and

$\gamma_t^d(G) \le |D_1 \cup S_2| = 2(n_1+\ell+2)/5 + 2(n_2+3)/5 - 2 = 2n/5 < (n-1)/2$, a contradiction.

Suppose $\ell \equiv 4 \,(\mathrm{mod}\, 5)$. Then, $n \ge 12$. By Table 3 $|S_1| = 2(n_1+\ell+1)/5$. Further, $|R_1| = |S_1| - 1$, $w_\ell \in R_1$, and R_1 DT-dominates $F - w_\ell$. If $n_2 \equiv 0 \,(\mathrm{mod}\, 5)$, then $R_1 \cup S_2$ is a DTD-set of G, and $\gamma_t^d(G) \le |R_1 \cup S_2| = 2(n_1+\ell+1)/5 + 2n_2/5 - 1 = (2n-3)/5 < (n-1)/2$, a contradiction. If $n_2 \equiv 1 \,(\mathrm{mod}\, 5)$, then $R_1 \cup D_2$ is a DTD-set of G, and $\gamma_t^d(G) \le |R_1 \cup D_2| = 2(n_1+\ell+1)/5 + 2(n_2-1)/5 = 2n/5 < (n-1)/2$, a contradiction. If $n_2 \equiv 2 \,(\mathrm{mod}\, 5)$, then $R_1 \cup R_2 \cup \{v\}$ is a DTD-set of G, and $\gamma_t^d(G) \le |R_1 \cup R_2 \cup \{v\}| = 2(n_1+\ell+1)/5 + 2(n_2-2)/5 = 2(n-1)/5 < (n-1)/2$, a contradiction. If $G_2 = C_4$, then $R_1 \cup S_2$ is a DTD-set of G, and $\gamma_t^d(G) \le |R_1 \cup S_2| = 2(n_1+\ell+1)/5 + 1 = 2(n-3)/5 + 1 = (2n-1)/5 < (n-1)/2$, a contradiction. Otherwise, if $n_2 \equiv 3$ or $4 \,(\mathrm{mod}\, 5)$, then $R_1 \cup T_2 \cup \{v\}$ is a DTD-set of G, and $\gamma_t^d(G) \le |R_1 \cup T_2 \cup \{v\}| \le 2(n_1+\ell+1)/5 + 2(n_2-3)/5 = 2(n-2)/5 < (n-1)/2$, a contradiction. (□)

By Claim Q.1, it follows, relabelling indices if necessary, that $n_i \not\equiv 0 \,(\mathrm{mod}\, 5)$ for $i = 1, 2$.

Claim Q.2 *If* $n_1 \equiv 1 \,(\mathrm{mod}\, 5)$, *then* $G \in \{D_b(4,6,1), D_b(3,6,2)\} \subset \mathcal{G}_b$.

Proof of Claim Q.2 Suppose $n_1 \equiv 1 \,(\mathrm{mod}\, 5)$. We examine each possibility for ℓ in turn.

Suppose $\ell \equiv 0 \,(\mathrm{mod}\, 5)$. Then, $n \ge 14$. By Table 3, $|S_1| = (2(n_1+\ell)+3)/5$ and $w_\ell \in S_1$. Further, we have R_1 with $|R_1| = |S_1| - 1$, $w_\ell \in R_1$ and R_1 DT-dominates $F - w_\ell$. If $n_2 \equiv 1 \,(\mathrm{mod}\, 5)$, then $S_1 \cup D_2$ is a DTD-set of G, and $\gamma_t^d(G) \le |S_1 \cup D_2| = (2(n_1+\ell)+3)/5 + 2(n_2-1)/5 = (2n+1)/5 < (n-1)/2$, a contradiction. If $n_2 \equiv 2 \,(\mathrm{mod}\, 5)$, then $S_1 \cup R_2$ is a DTD-set of G, and $\gamma_t^d(G) \le |S_1 \cup R_2| = (2(n_1+\ell)+3)/5 + 2(n_2-2)/5 = (2n-1)/5 < (n-1)/2$, a contradiction. If $G_2 = C_4$, then $R_1 \cup S_2$ is a DTD-set of G, and $\gamma_t^d(G) \le |R_1 \cup S_2| = (2(n_1+\ell)+3)/5 + 1 = (2(n-4)+3)/5 + 1 = 2n/5 < (n-1)/2$, a contradiction. Otherwise, if $n_2 \equiv 3$ or $4 \,(\mathrm{mod}\, 5)$, then $S_1 \cup T_2 \cup \{v\}$ is a DTD-set of G, and $\gamma_t^d(G) \le |S_1 \cup T_2 \cup \{v\}| \le (2(n_1+\ell)+3)/5 + 2(n_2-3)/5 + 1 = 2(n+1)/5 < (n-1)/2$, a contradiction.

Suppose $\ell \equiv 1 \,(\mathrm{mod}\, 5)$. Then, $n \ge 10$. By Table 3, $|S_1| = ((2n_1+\ell)+1)/5$ and $w_\ell \in S_1$. If $n_2 \equiv 1 \,(\mathrm{mod}\, 5)$, then $S_1 \cup D_2$ is a DTD-set of G, and $\gamma_t^d(G) \le (2(n_1+\ell)+1)/5 + 2(n_2-1)/5 = (2n-1)/5 < (n-1)/2$, a contradiction. If $n_2 \equiv 2 \,(\mathrm{mod}\, 5)$, then $S_1 \cup R_2$ is a DTD-set of G, and $\gamma_t^d(G) \le |S_1 \cup R_2| = ((2n_1+\ell)+1)/5 + 2(n_2-2)/5 = (2n-3)/5 < (n-1)/2$. If $G_2 = C_4$, then $n \ge 11$ and $S_1 \cup S_2$ is a DTD-set of G, and $\gamma_t^d(G) \le (2(n_1+\ell)+1)/5 + 2 = (2n+3)/5$. We have $\gamma_t^d(G) = (n-1)/2$ if $G = D_b(4,6,1) \cong G_2(0,1) \subset G_b$ for $n = 11$, and, for $n \ge 11$, $\gamma_t^d(G) < (n-1)/2$, a contradiction. Otherwise, if $n_2 \equiv 3$ or $4 \,(\mathrm{mod}\, 5)$, then $S_1 \cup T_2 \cup \{v\}$ is a DTD-set of G, and $\gamma_t^d(G) \le |S_1 \cup T_2 \cup \{v\}| \le (2(n_1+\ell)+1)/5 + 2(n_2-3)/5 + 1 = 2n/5 < (n-1)/2$, a contradiction.

Suppose $\ell \equiv 2 \,(\mathrm{mod}\, 5)$. Then, $n \ge 11$. By Table 3, $|S_1| = (2(n_1+\ell)-1)/5$. If $n_2 \not\equiv 2 \,(\mathrm{mod}\, 5)$, then $S_1 \cup S_2$ is a DTD-set of G, and $\gamma_t^d(G) \le |S_1 \cup S_2| \le (2(n_1+\ell)-1)/5 + 2(n_2+2)/5 = (2n+3)/5$. We have $\gamma_t^d(G) = (n-1)/2$ if $G = D_b(3,6,2) \cong G_2(1,0) \subset \mathcal{G}_b$ and $n = 11$, otherwise $\gamma_t^d(G) < (n-1)/2$, a contradiction. If $n_2 \equiv 2 \,(\mathrm{mod}\, 5)$, then $S_1 \cup R_2 \cup \{w_\ell\}$ is a DTD-set of G, and $\gamma_t^d(G) \le |S_1 \cup R_2 \cup \{w_\ell\}| = (2(n_1+\ell)-1)/5 + 2(n_2-2)/5 + 1 = 2n/5 < (n-1)/2$, a contradiction.

Suppose $\ell \equiv 3 \,(\mathrm{mod}\, 5)$. Then, $n \geq 12$. By Table 3, $|S_1| = 2(n_1 + \ell + 1)/5$. Further, we have R_1 with $|R_1| = |S_1| - 1$, and R_1 DT-dominates $F - w_\ell$. If $n_2 \equiv 1$, 2, 3 or 4 $(\mathrm{mod}\, 5)$, then $R_1 \cup S_2$ is a DTD-set of G, and $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq |R_1 \cup S_2| = 2(n_1 + \ell + 1)/5 + 2(n_2 + 3)/5 - 1 = (2n + 3)/5 < (n - 1)/2$, a contradiction.

Suppose $\ell \equiv 4 \,(\mathrm{mod}\, 5)$. Then, $n \geq 13$. By Table 3, $|S_1| = (2(n_1 + \ell) + 3)/5$. Further, there is a set D_1 with $|D_1| = |S_1| - 2$. If $n_2 \equiv 1$, 2, 3 or 4 $(\mathrm{mod}\, 5)$, then $D_1 \cup S_2$ is a DTD-set of G, and $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq |D_1 \cup S_2| \leq (2(n_1 + \ell) + 3)/5 + 2(n_2 + 3)/5 - 2 = (2n - 1)/5 < (n - 1)/2$, a contradiction. (□)

By Claim Q.2, it follows, relabelling indices if necessary, that $n_i \not\equiv 1 \,(\mathrm{mod}\, 5)$ for $i = 1, 2$.

Claim Q.3 *If $n_1 \equiv 2 \,(\mathrm{mod}\, 5)$, then $G \in \{D_b(4, 7, 2), D_b(3, 7, 3)\} \subset \mathcal{D}_b$.*

Proof of Claim Q.3 Suppose $n_1 \equiv 2 \,\mathrm{mod}\, 5$. We examine each possibility for ℓ in turn.

Suppose $\ell \equiv 0 \,(\mathrm{mod}\, 5)$. Then, $n \geq 15$. By Table 3, $|S_1| = 2(n_1 + \ell + 3)/5$. Further, $|D_1| = |S_1| - 2$. If $n_2 \equiv 2$, 3, or 4 $(\mathrm{mod}\, 5)$, then $D_1 \cup S_2$ is a DTD-set of G and $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq |D_1 \cup S_2| \leq 2(n_1 + \ell + 3)/5 + 2(n_2 + 3)/5 - 2 = 2(n + 1)/5 < (n - 1)/2$.

Suppose $\ell \equiv 1 \,(\mathrm{mod}\, 5)$. Then, $n \geq 11$. By Table 3, $|S_1| = 2(n_1 + \ell + 2)/5$ and $w_\ell \in S_1$. Further, we have R_1 with $|R_1| = |S_1| - 1$, $w_\ell \in R_1$ and R_1 DT-dominates $F - w_\ell$. If $G_2 = C_4$, then $n \geq 12$, $R_1 \cup S_2$ is a DTD-set of G, and $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq 2(n_1 + \ell + 2)/5 + 1 = 2(n - 2)/5 + 1 = (2n + 1)/5 < (n - 1)/2$, a contradiction. Hence, $G_2 \neq C_4$. Otherwise, if $n_2 \equiv 2$, 3, or 4 $(\mathrm{mod}\, 5)$, then $R_1 \cup T_2 \cup \{v\}$ is a DTD-set of G, and $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq |R_1 \cup T_2 \cup \{v\}| \leq 2(n_1 + \ell + 2)/5 + 2(n_2 - 2)/5 = 2n/5 < (n - 1)/2$, a contradiction.

Suppose $\ell \equiv 2 \,(\mathrm{mod}\, 5)$. Then, $n \geq 12$. By Table 3, $|S_1| = 2(n_1 + \ell + 1)/5$ and $w_\ell \in S_1$. If $G_2 = C_4$, then $n \geq 13$, $S_1 \cup S_2$ is a DTD-set of G, and $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq |S_1 \cup S_2| = 2(n_1 + \ell + 1)/5 + 2 = 2(n + 2)/5$. We have $\gamma_t^d(G) = (n - 1)/2$ and $G = D_b(4, 7, 2) \in \mathcal{D}_b$ if $n = 13$, and, for $n \geq 14$, $\gamma_t^d(G) < (n - 1)/2$, a contradiction. Otherwise, if $n_2 \equiv 2$, 3, or 4 $(\mathrm{mod}\, 5)$, then $S_1 \cup T_2 \cup \{v\}$ is a DTD-set of G, and $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq |S_1 \cup T_2 \cup \{v\}| \leq 2(n_1 + \ell + 1)/5 + 2(n_2 - 2)/5 + 1 = (2n + 3)/5 < (n - 1)/2$.

Suppose $\ell \equiv 3 \,(\mathrm{mod}\, 5)$. Then, $n \geq 13$. By Table 3, $|S_1| = 2(n_1 + l)/5$. If $n_2 \equiv 3$ or 4 $(\mathrm{mod}\, 5)$, then $S_1 \cup S_2$ is a DTD-set of G, and $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq 2(n_1 + \ell)/5 + 2(n_2 + 2)/5 = (2n + 4)/5$. We have $\gamma_t^d(G) = (n - 1)/2$ if $G = D_b(3, 7, 3) \in \mathcal{D}_b$ with $n = 13$ and, for $n \geq 14$, $\gamma_t^d(G) < (n - 1)/2$, a contradiction. If $n_2 \equiv 2 \,(\mathrm{mod}\, 5)$, then $S_1 \cup \{w_\ell\} \cup R_2$ is a DTD-set of G, and $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq |S_1 \cup R_2| + 1 = 2(n_1 + \ell)/5 + 2(n_2 - 2)/5 + 1 = (2n + 1)/5 < (n - 1)/2$, a contradiction.

Suppose $\ell \equiv 4 \,(\mathrm{mod}\, 5)$. Then, $n \geq 14$. By Table 3, $|S_1| = (2(n_1 + \ell) + 1)/5$. Further, we have R_1 with $|R_1| = |S_1| - 1$, and R_1 DT-dominates $F - w_\ell$. If $n_2 \equiv 2$, 3 or 4 $(\mathrm{mod}\, 5)$, then $R_1 \cup S_2$ is a DTD-set of G, and $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq |R_1 \cup S_2| \leq (2(n_1 + \ell) + 1)/5 + 2(n_2 + 3)/5 - 1 = 2(n + 1)/5 < (n - 1)/2$, a contradiction. (□)

By Claim Q.3, it follows, relabelling indices if necessary, that $n_i \not\equiv 2 \,(\mathrm{mod}\, 5)$ for $i = 1, 2$.

Claim Q.4 *If* $n_1 \equiv 3 \pmod 5$*, then* $G \in \{D_b(3,3,1), D_b(3,4,1),\ D_b(4,8,1),\ D_b(3,3,2),$ $D_b(3,8,2),\ D_b(3,4,6), D_b(3,3,7)\} \subset \mathcal{D}_b$ *or* $G \in \{D_b(3,4,2),\ D_b(3,3,3)\} \subset \mathcal{G}_b$.

Proof of Claim Q.4 Suppose $n_1 \equiv 3 \pmod 5$. We examine each possibility for ℓ in turn.

Suppose $\ell \equiv 0 \pmod 5$. Then, $n \geq 11$. By Table 3, $|S_1| = 2(n_1 + \ell + 2)/5$ and $w_\ell \in S_1$. Further, $|R_1| = |S_1| - 1$, $w_\ell \in R_1$ and R_1 DT-dominates $F - w_\ell$. If $G_2 = C_4$, then $n \geq 12$, $R_1 \cup S_2$ is a DTD-set of G, and $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq |S_1 \cup S_2| \leq 2(n_1+\ell+2)/5+1 = (2n+1)/5 < (n-1)/2$, a contradiction. Hence, $G_2 \neq C_4$. Otherwise, if $n_2 \equiv 3$ or $4 \pmod 5$, $R_1 \cup T_2 \cup \{v\}$ is a DTD-set of G, and $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq |R_1 \cup T_2 \cup \{v\}| \leq 2(n_1 + \ell + 2)/5 + 2(n_2 - 2)/5 = 2n/5 < (n-1)/2$, a contradiction.

Suppose $\ell \equiv 1 \pmod 5$. Then, $n \geq 7$. By Table 3, $|S_1| = 2(n_1 + \ell + 1)/5$ and $w_\ell \in S_1$. If $G_2 = C_4$, then $n \geq 8$, and $S_1 \cup S_2$ is a DTD-set of G. We have $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq |S_1 \cup S_2| = 2(n_1 + \ell + 1)/5 + 2 = 2(n+2)/5$. We have $\gamma_t^d(G) \geq (n-1)/2$ if $G \in \{D_b(3,4,1), D_b(4,8,1), D_b(3,4,6)\} \subset \mathcal{D}_b$ with $n \leq 13$ and, for $n \geq 14$, $\gamma_t^d(G) < (n-1)/2$, a contradiction. Hence, $G_2 \neq C_4$. Otherwise, if $n_2 \equiv 3$ or $4 \pmod 5$, then $S_1 \cup T_2 \cup \{v\}$ is a DTD-set of G, and $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq |S_1 \cup T_2| \leq 2(n_1 + \ell + 1)/5 + 2(n_2 - 2)/5 + 1 = (2n+1)/5$. We have $\gamma_t^d(G) = (n-1)/2$ if $G = D_b(3,3,1)$ with $n = 7$, otherwise $\gamma_t^d(G) < (n-1)/2$, a contradiction.

Suppose $\ell \equiv 2 \pmod 5$. Then, $n \geq 8$. By Table 3, $|S_1| = 2(n_1 + \ell)/5$. If $n_2 \equiv 3 \pmod 5$, then $S_1 \cup S_2$ is a DTD-set of G, and $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq |S_1 \cup S_2| \leq 2(n_1+\ell)/5+2(n_2+2)/5 = 2(n+2)/5$. We have $\gamma_t^d(G) \geq (n-1)/2$ and $G \in \{D_b(3,3,2), D_b(3,8,2), D_b(3,3,7)\} \subset \mathcal{D}_b$ for $n \leq 13$ and, for $n \geq 14$, $\gamma_t^d(G) < (n-1)/2$, a contradiction. If $n_2 \equiv 4 \pmod 5$, then $n \geq 9$, and $S_1 \cup S_2$ is a DTD-set of G. Further, $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq |S_1 \cup S_2| \leq 2(n_1+\ell)/5+2(n_2+1)/5 = 2(n+1)/5$. We have $\gamma_t^d(G) = (n-1)/2$ and $G = D_b(3,4,2) \cong G_0(1,1) \in \mathcal{G}_b$ with $n = 9$, otherwise $\gamma_t^d(G) < (n-1)/2$, a contradiction.

Suppose $\ell \equiv 3 \pmod 5$. Then, $n \geq 9$. By Table 3, $|S_1| = (2(n_1 + l) + 3)/5$. Further, $|R_1| = |S_1| - 1$ and R_1 DT-dominates $F - w_\ell$. If $n_2 \equiv 3$ or $4 \pmod 5$, then $R_1 \cup S_2$ is a DTD-set of G, and $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq |R_1 \cup S_2| \leq (2(n_1 + \ell) + 3)/5 + 2(n_2 + 2)/5 - 1 = 2(n+1)/5$. We have $\gamma_t^d(G) = (n-1)/2$, and $G = D_b(3,3,3) \cong G_0(2,0) \in \mathcal{G}_b$ with $n = 9$, otherwise $\gamma_t^d(G) < (n-1)/2$, a contradiction.

Suppose $\ell \equiv 4 \pmod 5$. Then, $n \geq 10$. By Table 3, $|S_1| = 2(n_1 + \ell + 2)/5$. Further, we have the set D_1 and $|D_1| = |S_1| - 2$. If $n_2 \equiv 3$ or $4 \pmod 5$, then $D_1 \cup S_2$ is a DTD-set of G, and $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq 2(n_1 + \ell + 3)/5 + 2(n_2 + 2)/5 - 2 = 2n/5 < (n-1)/2$, a contradiction. (□)

By Claim Q.4, it follows, relabelling indices if necessary, that $n_i \not\equiv 3 \pmod 5$ for $i = 1, 2$.

Claim Q.5 *If* $n_1 \equiv 4 \pmod 5$*, then* $G \in \{D_b(4,4,5)\} \subset \mathcal{G}_b$ *or* $G \in \{D_b(4,4,1)\} \subset \mathcal{G}_b$.

Proof of Claim Q.5 Suppose $G_1 = G_2 = C_4$. Then, $n = \ell + 8$. Let $P : w_1 \dots w_\ell$ be the path joining u to v. Let $G_1 = uu_1u_2u_3u$ and $G_2 = vv_1v_2v_3v$. Recall that u is adjacent to w_1 and v is adjacent to w_ℓ. Let $T' = \{u, u_1, v, v_1\}$. Now, for $\ell \geq 1$ construct the set T as follows: If $\ell = 1, 2, 3$ then let $T = \emptyset$. If $\ell = 4$, then let $T = \{w_\ell\}$. If

$\ell \geq 5$, then let T be a $\gamma_t^d(P - \{w_1, w_2, w_\ell\})$-set. Then, in this case, by Proposition 33, $|T| = \lceil 2(\ell-2)/5 \rceil + 1$ if $\ell \equiv 4 \pmod 5$ and $|T| = \lceil 2(\ell-2)/5 \rceil$ otherwise. If $1 \leq \ell \leq 4$, then $G \in \{D_b(4,4,1), D_b(4,4,2), D_b(4,4,3), D_b(4,4,4)\}$ and $T' \cup T$ is a DTD-set of G. Thus $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq |T' \cup T|$ and either $G = D_b(4,4,1)$ or $\gamma_t^d(G) < (n-1)/2$, a contradiction. Hence, assume $\ell \geq 5$, and so $n \geq 13$. Suppose $\ell \not\equiv 4 \pmod 5$. Then $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq |T' \cup T| \leq 2\ell/5 + 4 = 2(n-8)/5 + 4 = 2(n+2)/5$. We have, for $n = 13$, $G = D_b(4,4,5)$ and $\gamma_t^d(G) = (n-1)/2$, otherwise $\gamma_t^d(G) < (n-1)/2$. Suppose $\ell \equiv 4 \pmod 5$. Then $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq |T' \cup T| = 2(\ell + 1)/5 + 4 = (2n+6)/5$. We have $n \geq 17$. If $n = 17$, then $G = D_b(4,4,9)$ and it can be verified that $\gamma_t^d(G) = 7 < (n-1)/2$, otherwise $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq |T' \cup T| = (2n+6)/5 < (n-1)/2$, a contradiction. Thus at least one of G_1 and G_2, say $G_1 \neq C_4$.

Suppose $n_1 \equiv 4 \pmod 5$, with $n_1 \geq 9$. Suppose $\ell \not\equiv 4 \pmod 5$ and $G_2 = C_4$. By Table 3, $|S_1| \leq 2(n_1 + l + 1)/5$. Since $G_2 = C_4$, $n \geq 14$ and $S_1 \cup S_2$ is a DTD-set of G. We have $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq |S_1 \cup S_2| \leq 2(n_1 + \ell + 1)/5 + 2 = 2(n+2)/5 < (n-1)/2$, a contradiction. Suppose $\ell \equiv 4 \pmod 5$ and $G_2 = C_4$. By Table 3, $|S_1| = 2(n_1 + \ell + 2)/5$ and we have $|D_1| = |D_1| - 2$. Then, $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq |D_1 \cup S_2| \leq 2(n_1 + \ell + 2)/5 = 2(n-2)/5 < (n-1)/2$, a contradiction. Hence, $G_2 \neq C_4$ and it follows that $n \geq 19$. Further, by Table 3, $|S_1| \leq 2(n_1 + \ell + 2)$. By our previous claims we have $n_2 \equiv 4 \pmod 5$, and so $\gamma_t^d(G) \leq |S_1 \cup S_2| = 2(n_1 + \ell + 2)/5 + 2(n_2 + 1)/5 = 2(n+3)/5 < (n-1)/2$. (□)

Proposition 10 follows by Claims Q1–Q5. □

Recall the statement of Observation 17.

Observation 17 *A graph G of order $3 \leq n \leq 7$ is $\frac{1}{2}$-minimal if and only if $G \in \{B_1, B_2, D(3,3), D(4,4), D_b(3,4), D_b(3,3,1)\} \cup \{C_3, C_4, C_5, C_6, C_7\}$.*

Proof of Observation 17. Suppose G is a $\frac{1}{2}$-minimal graph of order $3 \leq n \leq 7$ and let $\Delta(G) = \Delta$ be the maximum degree of a vertex in G. If $3 \leq n \leq 6$, then $G \in \{B_1, D(3,3)\} \cup \{C_3, C_4, C_5, C_6\}$. Hence, $n = 7$. Further, we may suppose $\gamma_t^d(G) \geq 3$ and $2 \leq \Delta \leq 4$. If $\Delta = 2$, then $G = C_7$ and $\gamma_t^d(G) = 4$. Suppose $\Delta = 3$. Let u be a vertex of degree 3. If every vertex is within distance 2 of u, then $G = D_b(3,4)$ with u the vertex of degree 3 in G that belongs to the 4-cycle in G, or $\gamma_t^d(G) = 2$, a contradiction. Hence, assume that there is vertex in $G - N[u]$ which is not adjacent to a vertex in $N(u)$. Then, $G = B_2$, $G = D_b(3,3,1)$, $G = D_b(3,4)$ with u the vertex of degree 3 in G that belongs to the 3-cycle in G, or G is either not edge-minimal or has $\gamma_t^d(G) = 2$, both of which give a contradiction. Suppose $\Delta = 4$. Let u be a vertex of degree 4 in G, and let $V - N[u] = \{v, w\}$. If v and w have a common neighbor, then $\gamma_t^d(G) = 2$, a contradiction. If v and w are adjacent and have no common neighbor, then G contains a subgraph isomorphic to C_5 and $\gamma_t^d(G) = 2$, a contradiction. It follows that v and w are at least distance 3 apart, and so $G = D(4,4)$. □

Recall the statement of Observation 7.

Observation 7 *Let G be a graph with no isolated vertex and let F be a 4-subdivision of G. Then, $\gamma_t^d(F) \leq \gamma_t^d(G) + 2$.*

Proof of Observation 7. Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph with no isolated vertex. Let $e \in E$, where $e = uv$ be an edge of G. Let F be obtained from G by subdividing the edge e four times, so that F contains the path $P: uw_1w_2w_3w_4v$ which is not contained in G. Let S be a $\gamma_t^d(G)$-set. We show that the claim is true by considering each of the following three cases: $u, v \in S$; $u \in S$ and $v \notin S$; $u, v \notin S$. Suppose u, v in S. Then, $S \cup \{w_1, w_4\}$ is a DTD-set of F. Suppose $u \in S$ and $v \notin S$. Then, either $N_G(v) \cap S = \emptyset$ or $N_G(v) \cap S \neq \emptyset$. If $N_G(v) \cap S = \emptyset$, then $S \cup \{w_3, w_4\}$ is a DTD-set of F. If $N_G(v) \cap S \neq \emptyset$, then $S \cup \{w_2, w_4\}$ is a DTD-set of F. Suppose $u, v \notin S$. Then, $S \cup \{w_2, w_3\}$ is a DTD-set of F. Thus, in each case, $\gamma_t^d(F) \leq |S| + 2 = \gamma_t^d(G) + 2$. By symmetry, a similar result holds if $u \notin S$ and $v \in S$. This completes the proof. □